Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BV825.56 .F730 1917 1
Freestone, W. H. (William HerbertMAIN
The sacrament reserved : a survey of the
3 9967 00154 8895

THE
JESUIT-KRAUSS-McCORMICK
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/sacramentreserve0000wher

THE SACRAMENT RESERVED

Alcuin Club Collections
XXI

THE SACRAMENT RESERVED

A SURVEY OF THE PRACTICE OF RESERVING THE EUCHARIST, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK, DURING THE FIRST TWELVE CENTURIES

BY
W. H. FREESTONE, M.A.
Late of the House of the Resurrection, Mirfield

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
OXFORD: 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A.: THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.
1917
[*All rights reserved*]

BV
825.56
.F730
1917

REGENT - KNAUSS - McCORMICK - LIBRARY
1100 EAST 55th STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60615

Alcuin Club Collections
XXI

THE
SACRAMENT RESERVED

A SURVEY OF THE PRACTICE OF RESERVING THE EUCHARIST, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK, DURING THE FIRST TWELVE CENTURIES

BY
W. H. FREESTONE, M.A.
Late of the House of the Resurrection, Mirfield

BX
5141
.A1A6
v.21

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON : 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
OXFORD : 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A. : THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.
1917
[*All rights reserved*]

PREFACE

AS no attempt seems to have been made of late to gather material for a history of the practice of reserving the Eucharist, the collection published in the following pages may have some value, in spite of the fact that the author is a novice in ecclesiology. The chief aim, indeed, of the book has been to present in convenient and systematic form passages from readily accessible sources that refer more or less directly to reservation; but as the material has accumulated and fallen into order, certain deductions have become clear and need to be stated.

Some criticism will doubtless be disarmed if attention be called here to the limitations and deficiencies of the work.

It seemed, in the first place, inadvisable to pursue the subject beyond a date at which the custom of the Western Church had become generally fixed and uniform. By setting a term to the period surveyed, it was possible to confine the attention mainly to the conditions under which reservation was practiced for the sick, without digressing into the discussion of other purposes for which the reserved Eucharist was later employed. A landmark is obviously reached in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), where the most important conclusion about eucharistic doctrine arrived at in the previous era was definitely adopted, and, under the term transubstantiation, became the accepted teaching of the Western Church. It might naturally be asked why, in a history of clinical communion, where the practical question arises as to the advisability or the reverse of employing both species of the sacrament, the survey is not carried down to the date at which concomitance was enunciated as *de fide*. The answer to this will be found, so the writer believes, in the text of the book itself. The implication of what was afterwards defined as concomitance is here shown to be a constant feature of customs associated with the reserved Eucharist in primitive as well as in later times; and the practice of administering the single species of Bread to the whole and to the sick had become universal in the West long before the specific reassertion at Trent of the doctrine implied.

There are two places where the charge of inadequacy may be anticipated.

One occurs at the section which deals with the place of reservation. The only plea that can be urged is that information concerning this point is surprisingly scarce before the eleventh century. The other is the hiatus in the history of reservation in the East. Such references as could readily be found in the Greek Fathers and early oriental writers have been included, as well as some note of customs followed by the Eastern Churches in modern times, but the inaccessibility of whatever intervening sources may exist prevented the writer from supplying the missing connection. This omission is probably a less grave defect than might at first appear, for there seems to be a general agreement among authorities that no important modifications have taken place in the East since the adoption of intinction. Unfortunately, however, the date at which this mode of communicating first appeared cannot be ascertained with certainty.

The work was undertaken at the suggestion of the Rev. Dr. W. H. Frere, C.R., and has progressed under his supervision. To him the author lies under deep obligations, but at the same time assumes entire responsibility for whatever errors may be detected. The Rev. R. H. Baker, C.R., gave much aid in the early stages of the book. To Dr. Frere and to the Rev. L. S. Thornton, C.R., who most kindly undertook to see it through the press when the writer was called to service abroad, it is difficult to express the gratitude which their generosity evokes.

The Rev. F. E. Brightman, D.D., of Oxford; the Rev. F. N. Heazell, of Letchworth; and the Rev. Nersès G. Sevadjian, of the Armenian Church in Manchester, and others have kindly furnished valuable information.

W. H. FREESTONE.

HOUSE OF THE RESURRECTION, MIRFIELD.
Whitsun Eve, 1916.

NOTE.—The author, who had been since January 1913 a probationer of the Community of the Resurrection, has not been permitted to see his work in print. He was reported killed on December 14th, 1916, while serving as chaplain to the forces on the Macedonian front.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
PREFACE		v

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

CHAP.		
I.	THE TERMS EPHODION AND VIATICUM	3
	COMMUNION AND THE HOUR OF DEATH	10

THE MINISTRATION OF THE EUCHARIST TO THE SICK AND OTHERS

II.	*A.* OFFICIAL DISTRIBUTION FROM THE PUBLIC CELEBRATION OF THE LITURGY	16
III.	*B.* PRIVATE CELEBRATIONS OF THE LITURGY	24
IV.	*C.* THE EUCHARIST RESERVED PRIVATELY	32
	PRIVATE RESERVATION BY THE LAITY	35
V.	PRIVATE RESERVATION BY RELIGIOUS	51
	USE OF THE RESERVED EUCHARIST AT CONSECRATION OF A VIRGIN	59
VI.	PRIVATE RESERVATION BY THE CLERGY	61
	USE OF THE RESERVED EUCHARIST AT ORDINATION	65

PECULIAR USES OF THE RESERVED EUCHARIST

VII.	*a.* EULOGIAE	70
	b. FERMENTUM	73
	c. SANCTA	77
	d. COMMUNION OF THE PRESANCTIFIED	80
	e. CONSUMPTION OF THE REMAINS AFTER THE LITURGY	93
	f. ADMINISTRATION TO THE DEAD, AND OTHER ABUSES	98

PART II. OFFICIAL RESERVATION FOR THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK

VIII.	OFFICIAL RESERVATION DURING THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES	105
IX.	OFFICIAL RESERVATION DURING THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES	120
	i. THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES	120
	ii. THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES	131

CHAP. PAGE

x. OFFICIAL RESERVATION AND THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY - 144
i. THE USE OF INTINCTION - 144
ii. THE DISPUTE CONCERNING INTINCTION - 152
iii. EFFECT UPON THE METHODS OF CLINICAL COMMUNION 165
xi. COMMUNION IN THE SINGLE SPECIES OF WINE - 176
xii. RENEWAL OF THE RESERVED EUCHARIST - 182
xiii. THE PLACE OF RESERVATION - 188
xiv. THE VESSEL OF RESERVATION - 200
BENEDICTION OF THE VESSEL OF RESERVATION - 218
xv. THE MINISTER OF THE RESERVED EUCHARIST - 220
xvi. THE RITE OF CLINICAL COMMUNION - 231
xvii. SOME CUSTOMS OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES IN CONNECTION WITH THE RESERVED EUCHARIST - 247

APPENDIX

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE EXTRA-LITURGICAL CULTUS OF THE EUCHARIST - 256
LIST OF PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES - 267
INDEX - 271

PART I

INTRODUCTORY

CHAPTER I

The Terms Ephodion and Viaticum

BY secular authors the word *ἐφόδιον* (or more commonly, the plural form *ἐφόδια*) is used with the primary meaning of a supply of provisions for a journey or military expedition ; and in derivative senses, to express the ideas of ways and means, support or maintenance.[1]

But there are instances among the poets and philosophical writers, where *ἐφόδιον* passes from a physical sense to one of moral, almost of religious significance. A pious career, for example, is termed the supreme *ἐφόδιον*, or goodness is an admirable *ἐφόδιον* for the journey of life.[2] Such a meaning as the word bears in these and similar contexts would facilitate its transference to the vocabulary of those who were accustomed to think and speak of their religion as "the Way." [3]

It would be interesting to learn whether in connection with the pagan mysteries, or under similar influence, the term acquired any technical sense in which it had become current by the time that the Christian era opened. Evidence on this point is not forthcoming, but, in any case, it seems to have been at the stage of development indicated in the quotations alluded to above that the Church began to make use of the word and to invest it, as she did so many other expressions borrowed from the common speech of the Mediterranean, with a depth and variety of meaning greater than it had previously borne. Herein lies the

[1] v. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v.

[2] Epicharmus, 152 *Ahrens*, "εὐσεβὴς βίος μέγιστον ἐφόδιον" : Menander, Ὑμν. I, "ἡ χρηστότης . . . θαυμαστὸν ἐφόδιον βίῳ" (quoted in Liddell and Scott, *Lex.*). Plutarch, *Mor.* p. 160 B., "ὡς μὴ μόνον τοῦ ζῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἀποθνήσκειν τὴν τροφὴν ἐφόδιον οὖσαν" : cf. Seneca, *Epist.* lxvii. 3.

[3] *Acts* xix. 23, and elsewhere. *ἐφόδιον* is not found in the N.T. ; but in the LXX. the term is used for the store that is to be given to a Hebrew bondsman, when he goes out in the year of release : "ἐφόδιον ἐφοδιάσεις αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων σου. κ.τ.λ." (*Deut.* xv. 14.)

point of an interesting remark made by St. Gregory Thaumaturgus in his *Panegyric on Origen*. He quotes his own heathen tutor as telling him, at the beginning of a course of study, that education in the Roman Law would be his most valuable ἐφόδιον, whatever public career he might later choose. "He was," says St. Gregory, "more inspired than he knew": and he proceeds to relate the circumstances of his legal studies, and their ultimate effect in determining the course of his life towards religion.[1]

Before the close of the first century we find St. Clement of Rome using the word in a religious sense when he writes of the ἐφόδια of Christ, in reference to the life of the Church at Corinth;[2] and from this date onward the remains of Christian literature illustrate the change into wider and fuller significance that the term underwent as the consequence of its reception into the language of the Church.

Indeed, we can trace its development within the works of a single author. Probst[3] selects from the writings of St. Clement of Alexandria a number of passages that show, not only the growth of the religious context of the term, but also the beginnings of the increasing tendency to apply it more particularly to that spiritual provision for the way which a Christian receives in the last stage of his journey.

As with the heathen poets, so with the Christian theologian, virtues are ἐφόδια. Charity forms a rich ἐφόδιον,[4] and so does self-control (ἐγκράτεια).[5] The religious exercise of contemplation is another form of "food for the

[1] *Oratio paneg. in Origen*, 5. "ὅ μοι ἀληθέστατα πάντων ἀποβέβηκε μέγιστον ἔσεσθαί μοι ἐφόδιον (τοῦτο γὰρ τοὔνομα ἐκεῖνος ὠνόμασεν) . . . τὴν μάθησιν τῶν νόμων . . . ὁ μὲν οὕτως ἀπεφθέγξατο, τείνων εἰς τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τὸν λόγον. ἐμοὶ δ' ἀτεχνῶς ὑπό τινι θειοτέρᾳ ἐπιπνοίᾳ ἀποφοιβάσαι δοκεῖ της αὐτοῦ ὑπολήψεως." (*P.G.* x. 1065.)

[2] *Epist. I. ad Corinth.* 2. ". . . τοῖς ἐφοδίοις Χριστοῦ ἀρκούμενοι . . ." Lightfoot (*Apost. Fathers*, pt. 1, vol. ii, p. 13) read ἐφ. Θεοῦ, and understood the phrase to refer to bodily sustenance, citing the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the Romans (in Eusebius, *H.E.* iv. 23): "ἐκκλησίαις τε πολλαῖς ταῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐφόδια πέμπειν." He takes the sense to be the same as 1 *Tim.* iv. 8.

The Latin version (published in *Anecdota Maredsolana*, 1894) renders the phrase "*alimentis Christi*," and so establishes the reading ἐφ. Χριστοῦ.

[3] *Sakramente u. Sakramentalien*, pp. 237, 238.

[4] *Paedag.* II. 7: "ἀγαθὴ γὰρ κουροτρόφος εἰς κοινωνίαν ἀγάπη ἐφόδιον ἔχουσα πλούσιον."

[5] *op. cit.* III. 39.

way,"[1] while God Himself is spoken of as the ἐφόδιον of eternal life.[2]

But Clement also seems to use the word in a more limited and concrete sense. In describing the stages of the Christian life, at the end of a passage that speaks of the privileges of the catechumenate, he adds, "And such as have been properly brought up in the words of truth, and have received provision for eternal life (ἐφόδια ζωῆς ἀϊδίου), mount up to heaven as on wings."[3] The section following this sentence deals with the Eucharist, which also seems to be intended here as the privilege that terminates the period of instruction and probation. Such an interpretation fits in most easily with the rest of the context.

But the term continued for some time to be used with a more general significance. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his lectures to catechumens, calls the Christian Faith by this name because it is a support and stay for the whole course of life.[4]

Still less restricted and definite is the use of the word in St. Basil's letter to Meletius of Antioch. Here he speaks in a general way of the ἐφόδια or helps in the present life and in the life to come; among which he reckons the edification that he might receive from an interview with his correspondent:[5] and, again, in a commendatory epistle, the address of which has been lost, he declares that the bearer has chosen a good ἐφόδιον for eternity, because he has thrown in his lot with them that fear the Lord.[6]

Further instances of the use of ἐφόδιον with a more or less defined religious connotation, or as a general expression

[1] *Strom.* VII. 13. [2] *op. cit.* IV. 6.

[3] *op. cit.* I. 1: "οἱ δὲ ἐντραφέντες γνησίως τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας λόγοις ἐφόδια ζωῆς ἀϊδίου λαβόντες εἰς οὐρανὸν πτεροῦνται." Here are memories of Isa. xl. 31, and of Ps. ciii. 5; the latter having eucharistic associations.

[4] *Homil. Catech.* v. 21: ". . . ἔχειν τε ταύτην [sc. τὴν πίστιν] ἐφόδιον ἐν παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ παρὰ ταύτην ἄλλην μηκέτι δέξασθαι. . . ." (*P.G.* xxxiii. 521.)

[5] *Epist.* (*lvii*) *ad Melet*: "Εἰ δὲ καταξιωθείημεν ταῖς σαῖς προσευχαῖς, ἕως ἐσμὲν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τῆς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς συντυχίας, καὶ παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς ζώσης φωνῆς λαβεῖν ὠφέλιμα διδάγματα, ἢ ἐφόδια πρός τε τὸν ἐνεστῶτα αἰῶνα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα, τοῦτο ἂν μέγιστον τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκρίναμεν. . . ." (*P.G.* xxxii. 408.)

[6] *Epist.* ccxlix.: "Ἀγαθὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐφόδιον πρὸς τὸν ἐφεξῆς αἰῶνα, τὴν μετὰ τῶν φοβουμένων τὸν κύριον ἀγαθὴν διαγωγὴν ἐξελέξατο." (*P.G.* xxxii. 929.)

for the means of grace are to be found scattered throughout the writers of the patristic period.[1] It is applied figuratively to baptism by St. Cyril of Jerusalem,[2] and St. Gregory Nazianzen uses the verb *ἐφοδιάζω* for the act of baptizing a dying man.[3] In regard to the use of the term for baptism, it is possible that at first no other form of *ἐφόδιον* was conceded to the catechumen who died before his time of probation was complete. By baptism he would receive remission of sin; he would be gathered into the ark of salvation. So indispensable a sacrament would not be denied to any who were stricken down in the period of preparation (provided that their conduct had been satisfactory); and baptism may generally have been deemed to be all that was necessary in order to secure the salvation of the catechumen. At all events, when the case of dying *energumens* (or possessed persons) was discussed in council at Elvira (*c.* 300), a distinction was made between those who were still in the catechumenate and those who had been baptized. The latter were to receive the communion, but for the former baptism alone was held to suffice.[4] The same council also declared that if a person baptized by a deacon should die without

[1] *e.g.* Basil, *de Spirit. Sanct.* 66: Euseb. *H.E.* viii. 10, etc. For other instances cf. Bright, *Canons of the first four General Councils*, pp. 51, 52.

[2] *Hom. in Baptism.* 5. (*P.G.* xxxi. 432.)

[3] *Orat.* xl. 11. (*P.G.* xxxvi. 372.)

[4] *Can.* 37. "De energumenis non baptizatis. Eos qui ab immundis spiritibus vexantur, si in fine mortis fuerint constituti, baptizari placet: si fideles fuerint, dandam esse communionem." (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, I. pt. 1, p. 241.) Clinical baptism, without mention of communion, is referred to again in *Can.* 33. This sacrament may be administered, in case of need, by a layman, but it must be perfected, if the sick man recovers, by the laying on of the bishop's hands (and communion). Normally, as is well known, the newly baptized and confirmed (infants and adults alike) received the Eucharist at the earliest possible moment after their initiation into the Christian Society. (Justin M. *Apol.* I. 65.) For the communion of infants immediately after baptism, cf. Cyprian, *de lapsis*, 25. Augustine thinks it necessary to salvation that they should be communicated, *Serm.* clxxiv. 6, 7, in *P.L.* xxxviii. 944; *contra Julian. op imperf.* in *P.L.* xlv. 1154; *de peccat. mer.* i. 20, 24, 34. Passages sometimes quoted from this father, in which the opposite view seems to be urged or admitted, *e.g. contra duas epist. Pelag.* i. 22, 40 (*P.L.* xliv. 570), are dealt with in the notes of the Benedictine editors of *Augustini Opera*, on *de peccat. mer.* i. 20, 26.

receiving confirmation (and so, implicitly, communion), he is nevertheless to be thought of as saved, by virtue of his faith confessed in baptism.[1]

But these are exceptional instances. As the same series of canons clearly shows,[2] the Eucharist was normally given in the hour of death, and so *ἐφόδιον* soon came to bear the restricted and definite meaning of the last communion. At the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), the custom of giving the Eucharist to the dying was referred to as well established and of long standing. "Concerning the dying, let the ancient and canonical rule still be kept, that none be deprived at the hour of death of the last and most necessary *ἐφόδιον* . . . and, after due examination, the bishop is to give the Eucharist to every one who asks for it at the end."[3]

To this canon St. Gregory of Nyssa alludes in the Canonical Epistle addressed to Bishop Letoius of Melitene, wherein he gives rules for dealing with eight classes of penitents. "And," he writes, "if the penitent lies dying before he has fulfilled his allotted term of penance, the mercifulness of the Fathers bids him partake of the

[1] *Can.* 77. "De baptizatis qui nondum confirmati moriuntur. Si quis diaconus regens plebem sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit; quod si ante de saeculo recesserint, sub fide qua quis credidit poterit esse justus." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* p. 261.)

[2] *Can.* 32. ". . . cogente tamen infirmitate necesse est presbyterem communionem praestare debere; et diaconum si ei jusserit sacerdos. . . ." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* p. 238.)

[3] *Can.* 13. "*περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐξοδευόντων ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος φυλαχθήσεται καὶ νῦν, ὥστε εἴ τις ἐξοδεύοι, τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθαι. εἰ δὲ ἀπογνωσθεὶς καὶ κοινωνίας πάλιν τυχὼν (πάλιν) ἐν τοῖς ζῶσιν ἐξετασθῇ, μετὰ τῶν κοινωνούντων τῆς εὐχῆς μόνης ἔστω. καθόλου δὲ καὶ περὶ παντὸς οὑτινοσοῦν ἐξοδεύοντος αἰτοῦντος τοῦ μετασχεῖν εὐχαριστίας, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος μετὰ δοκιμασίας ἐπιδότω.*" For *ἐπιδότω*, some versions have as the final clause *μεταδιδότω τῆς προσφορᾶς*. It has been doubted on very insufficient grounds, whether *ἐφ.* here necessarily means the sacrament; there is really no ambiguity in the text (Bright, *Canons*, pp. 50 ff.). References to this canon are frequently made by later Synods, *e.g.* Concil. Aurant. (Orange, A.D. 441), Can. 3: "Qui recedunt de corpore, poenitentia accepta, placuit sine reconciliatione manus impositione eis communicari: quod morientibus sufficit consolationi secundum definitiones patrum, qui hujus modi communionem viaticum nominarunt." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* II. pt. 1, p. 436.)

hallowed elements, that he may not be sent forth empty on his last long journey." [1]

As an ecclesiastical term, *viaticum* (the equivalent of ἐφόδιον) is naturally of later date; but as soon as Latin became the common speech of the Western Church, the word was bound to acquire the definite technical meaning that had come to be affixed to the older term. Indeed, in ecclesiastical usage, *viaticum* (because of its later appearance) seems always to mean the Eucharist: evidence for the existence of any earlier or wider use, or more general application, corresponding to that which we have noted in connection with ἐφόδιον, does not appear to exist.[2] The term occurs frequently in the decrees of councils that reinforced or modified the Nicene directions as to the right even of the lapsed, if penitent, to the comfort of communion at the last. We may here note that De l'Aubespine,[3] followed by other writers, contended that where the word *communio* is used (instead of *viaticum*) in early conciliar material concerned with the discipline of the dying, we are to understand a reference to some rite that restored a penitent *in extremis* to the communion or fellowship of the Church. According to this interpretation, a form of absolution was employed in these cases, and so the administration of the Eucharist as *viaticum* was actually less general than it would appear to have been. This contention may be taken as wholly disproved.[4]

As to the disciplinary conditions at first attached to the administration of *viaticum* we have no detailed information. By the time of St. Cyprian a regular penitential system had developed, but it is not possible to form more than a general notion of it from perusal of his writings.[5] The rigour that

[1] *Epist. Canon. ad Letoium.* 5. ". . . εἰ δέ τις μὴ πληρώσας τὸν χρόνον τόν ἐκ τῶν κανόνων ἀφορισμένον ἐξοδεύοι τοῦ βίου, κελεύει ἡ τῶν πατέρων φιλανθρωπία μετασχόντα τῶν ἁγιασμάτων μὴ κενὸν τοῦ ἐφοδίου πρὸς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἐκείνην καὶ μακρὰν ἀποδημίαν ἐκπεμφθῆναι." (*P.G.* xlv. 232.) Other paragraphs of this letter contain further allusions to the policy laid down at Nicaea.

[2] A full list of the various meanings acquired by the term *viaticum* in the Middle Ages is given by Ducange, *Gloss.* s.v.

[3] "*De Veteribus Ecclesiae Ritibus*," passim. (Helmstadt, 1672.)

[4] Frank, *Bussdisciplin*, pp. 739, 745, 889, 896–903 (cited by Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*).

[5] cf. *Epist.* viii. 3, etc. (Bright, *Canons*, pp. 53, 54).

prevailed in this matter in the times of the earlier persecutions can hardly have surpassed, even if it rivalled, the severity that marks the canons promulged at Elvira. The text of the first of these has been amended to give this sense: "If an adult Christian has been guilty of idolatrous sacrifice, he may not receive communion, even on his death-bed."[1] Thus, twenty-five years before Nicaea the custom of fortifying the dying with the Eucharist was recognized, and the administration of *viaticum* was prohibited where sentence of utter excommunication had been pronounced. Most later councils took a more merciful view and allowed any sincere penitent *in articulo mortis* to receive the sacrament, on the understanding that, in case of recovery, whatever part of the penance still remained to be performed should be duly worked out.[2]

[1] *Can.* I. "Placuit inter eos (*leg.* nos). Qui post fidem baptismi salutaris adulta aetate ad templum idoli idollaturus (*leg.* idolatraturus) accesserit et fecerit quod est crimen capitale, quia est summi sceleris, placuit nec in finem eum communionem accipere." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* I. pt. 1, p. 221. cf. also Dale, *Synod of Elvira*, pp. 93, 96, 108, etc.)

[2] *e.g.* Ancyra (A.D. 314); can. 6, cf. can. 4, 5; Nicaea (A.D. 325), can. 13, etc. At a later date (A.D. 374) the milder attitude was taken at Valentia, can. 3; [at the Gallican Synod (? Concil. Leptinense, A.D. 743) that promulged the canons once referred to "iv. Carthage," can. 77, 78: "Poenitentes qui in infirmitate viaticum Eucharistiae acceperint non se credant absolutos sine manus impositione, si supervixerint."] Pope Innocent's advice on this point to Bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse is as follows: "Et hoc quaesitum est, quid de his observari oporteat, qui post baptismum omni tempore incontinentiae voluptatibus dediti, in extremo fine vitae suae poenitentiam simul et reconciliationem communionis exposcunt. De his observatio prior durior, posterior interveniente misericordia inclinatior est. Nam consuetudo prior tenuit ut concederetur eis poenitentia, sed communio negaretur. Nam cum illis temporibus crebrae persecutiones essent, ne communione concessa facilitas homines de reconciliatione securos non revocaret a lapsu, negata merito communio est: et duriorem remissionem fecit temporis ratio. Sed postea quam dominus noster pacem ecclesiis suis reddidit, jam terrore depulso, communionem dari abeuntibus placuit, et propter domini misericordiam quasi viaticum profecturis, et ne Novatiani haeretici negantis veniam asperitatem et duritiam sequi videamur. Tribuitur ergo cum poenitentia extrema communio, ut homines hujus modi vel in supremis suis poenitentes, miserante salvatore nostro, a perpetuo exitio vindicentur." (Hard. i. 1003.) A succinct account of the change of policy in regard to such cases, and of the altered conditions that were the cause of the change. The same principles are asserted by Pope Celestine (*Epist. ad episc. Galliae*). (Hard. i. 1259.) The First Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) and many subsequent councils and synods in East and West published similar decrees.

COMMUNION AND THE HOUR OF DEATH

The faithful and, as a general rule, the penitent receive *viaticum* of the Eucharist in the hour of death. This is made clear, as we have seen, by explicit statements after the end of the third century. Direct evidence for earlier ages is scarce, but there are passages in the works of the most primitive writers where the sacrament is closely associated in thought with the end of earthly life.

It is quite possible that a reference to the last communion received by the martyr in preparation for his trial[1] is to be found in the Epistle of St. Ignatius of Antioch to the Romans. In the fifth chapter and in those that follow he expresses his passionate longing to meet death in the arena, and entreats the Roman Christians not to hinder the consummation that he desires. He goes on to say, "I desire the Bread of God, which is the Flesh of Christ . . . and, for a draught, I desire His Blood, which is incorruptible love."[2]

Here the Eucharist and the death-hour are closely linked; and the liturgical memories that seem to lurk in the prayer of St. Polycarp at the stake may hint at the same connection in thought.[3]

It is not uncommon, in the acts and passions of the saints, to find a vision of the Eucharist in some symbolical form accepted as prophetic of imminent martyrdom. St. Perpetua (†A.D. 203) describes in detail a vision that announced her passion. She saw a wide and open champaign, in the midst of which sat a noble figure dressed as a shepherd and milking his flock, with a white-robed company about him. He greeted her and gave her a piece of cheese. "And I," she says, "placing my hands together, received it and ate it; and all those that were standing around said, Amen. And at the sound of this word I awoke, and found myself still eating something

[1] v. infra. p. 12.

[2] *ad Romanos*, 7. "ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω ὅ ἐστιν σὰρξ τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ, καὶ πόμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος." (Lightfoot, *The Apost. Fathers* (Texts), p. 122.)

[3] *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, 14. Lightfoot, *op. cit.* pp. 194, 195. It has been suggested that the prayer is an adaptation of a primitive "Canon of the Mass."

sweet." She told her brother of her dream, and they agreed that it portended the imminence of martyrdom.[1] The figure of the Good Shepherd and the eucharistic allusions are unmistakable.

Another dream of similar import is related in the *Passion of St. Philip*, Bishop of Heraclea (†A.D. 304). Hermes the deacon, who suffered at the same time as his bishop, assured the crowd as he was led to execution that his death had been foretold him by the Lord. For, as he lay asleep, a white dove flew in to him and perched on his head, and then, settling upon his breast, it conveyed a sweet-tasting morsel into his mouth. "I knew immediately that the Lord had deigned to call me, and deemed me worthy to suffer."[2]

Throughout the persecutions the Eucharist was celebrated in all manner of circumstances, so that those who were in danger might be fortified against the trial of faith, and be prepared for death.

Tertullian, in his work *De fuga in persecutione* (written after his lapse into Montanism), urges the Christians who looked to him as their leader not to forgo their accustomed rites in the time of peril. They must let nothing hinder them from celebrating the ordinances of the Lord (*dominica sollemnia*)[3] which surely means the Liturgy.

[1] *Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis.* This is the second scene in her dream. She had first to pass a guardian dragon and a stairway beset with swords, spears, hooks, and the like. Then follows the eucharistic vision: "et vidi spatium immensum horti, et in medio sedentem hominem canum in habitu pastoris, grandem, oves mulgentem; et circumstantes candidati milia multa. Et levavit caput et aspexit me et dixit mihi: Bene venisti, tecnon. Et clamavit me et de caseo quod mulgebat dedit mihi quasi buccellam; et ego accepi junctis manibus et manducavi; et universi circumstantes dixerunt, *Amen*. Et ad sonum vocis experrecta sum, commanducans adhuc dulce nescio quid. Et retuli statim fratri meo, et intelleximus passionem esse futurum: et coepi jam nullam spem in saeculo habere." (Gebhardt, *Acta Mart. Selecta*, pp. 67–69.)

[2] *Passio S. Philippi episc. Heracleae.* "Hoc me passurum, deo ac domino jam ante annuntiante, cognoveram revelatione certissima. Nam cum dulci sopore devinctus facerem, columba mihi visa est niveo candore perlucida, cubiculum illud ingressa, subito in medio capite consedisse; quae et inde descendens in pectus, escas mihi gratissimi cibi offerens, statim cognovi quod me dominus vocare dignatus est, et dignum habuit passione." (Ruinart, *Acta Mart. sincera et selecta* (1859), p. 447.)

[3] *De fuga* 14: "Sed quomodo colligemus, inquis, quomodo dominica sollemnia celebrabimus? . . . Si colligere interdiu non potes, habes

Turning to the writings of St. Cyprian we find numerous passages that allude to the intimate connection of the Eucharist with the imminence of mortal peril. In a letter sent from his place of retirement to the clergy of Carthage, he refers to their habit of celebrating the Liturgy in the prisons for the communion of the confessors, and bids them use discretion in their ministrations, so that they may avoid trouble with the imperial authorities.[1]

Again, in a description of how the Christian confessor or martyr should be made ready for the contest, communion is regarded as a necessary part of the customary preparation. "Let us arm the right hand with a spiritual sword, that it may reject these deadly sacrifices; and so, mindful of the Eucharist, the hand that has received the Body of the Lord may lay hold upon the Lord Himself."[2]

Even more definite are the statements made in the synodical letter sent by Cyprian and the African bishops to Pope Cornelius. In this is set forth the policy pursued by the Catholics of the province in regard to the penitent *lapsi*. A synod summoned in May, A.D. 252, had decided that, in view of an expected outburst of persecution, all those *lapsi* who had shown signs of penitence were to be reconciled immediately, so that they might be strengthened by the sacraments for further conflict. "For," said the bishops, "a man cannot possibly be fit for martyrdom whom the Church has not armed for the battle."[3]

noctem. . . . Non potes discurrere per singulos; sit tibi et in tribus ecclesia." (*P.L.* ii. 119.)

[1] "Consulite ergo et providete ut cum temperamento fieri hoc tutius possit, ita ut presbyteri quoque qui illic apud confessores offerunt, singuli cum singulis diaconis per vices alternent, quia et mutatio personarum et vicissitudo convenientium minuit invidiam." (*Ep.* iv. in *P.L.* iv. 231.)

[2] *Epist. ad Thibaritanos*, 9: "armemus et dexteram gladio spirituali, ut sacrificia funesta fortiter respuat ut, eucharistiae memor, quae domini corpus accepit ipsum conplectatur, postmodum a domino sumptura praemium coelestium coronarum." (*Ep.* lvi. in *P.L.* iv. 357.)

[3] *Epist. Synod.* (lvii). ". . . Sed enim cum videamus diem rursus alterius infestationis appropinquare coepisse et crebris adque assiduis ostensionibus admoneamur ut ad certamen quod nobis hostis indicit armati et parati simus, plebem etiam nobis de divina dignatione commissam exhortationibus nostris paremus, et omnes omnino milites Christi qui arma desiderant et proelium flagitant intra castra dominica colli-

The indulgence permitted to those who, after falling away, repented and desired absolution and communion is illustrated by the well-known story told by Dionysius of Alexandria († *c.* A.D. 264) and preserved by Eusebius. This is one of the most informing examples of clinical communion that has come to us from early times.

An old man, named Serapion, who had lapsed during the Decian or some earlier persecution, had continued excommunicate in spite of the fact that he had long lived blamelessly and had often asked that he might be reconciled. In his last illness he sent by night for his little nephew, and bade him run for a priest.[1] As the priest was himself sick and unable to come, he gave the boy a small portion of the Eucharist, bidding him to soak it and to lay it in the old man's mouth. Serapion lay in

gamus: necessitate cogente censuimus eis qui de ecclesia domini non recesserunt et poenitentiam agere et lamentari ac dominum deprecari a primo lapsus sui die non destiterunt, pacem dandam esse et eos quod imminet armari et instrui oportere. . . .

"At vero nunc non infirmis sed fortibus pax necessaria est nec morientibus sed viventibus communicatio a nobis danda est, ut quos excitamus et hortamur ad proelium non inermes et nudos relinquamus, sed protectione sanguinis et corporis Christi muniamus, et cum ad hoc fiat eucharistia ut possit accipientibus esse tutela, quos tutos esse contra adversarium volumus, munimento dominicae saturitatis armemus. Nam quomodo docemus aut provocamus eos in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus? Aut quomodo ad martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad bibendum in ecclesia poculum domini jure communicationis admittimus? . . .

"Nec quisquam dicat: qui martyrium tollit sanguine suo baptizatur, nec pax illi ab episcopo necessaria est habituro gloriae suae pacem et accepturo majorem de domini dignatione mercedem. Primo idoneus esse non potest ad martyrium qui ab ecclesia non armatur ad proelium, et mens deficit quam non recepta eucharistia erigit et accendit. . . ." (Hartel, *op. cit.* pp. 650 ff.) This is *Ep. Synod.* (*P.L.* iii. 851 ff).

Probably an echo of these times survives in prayers commemorating the martyrs contained in the Leonian Sacramentary, *e.g.* the phrase "sacrificium singulare, quod sanctis tuis in passione contulit claritatem." (Feltoe, *Sacr. Leon.*, p. 90.)

[1] A presbyter might reconcile a penitent in case of necessity, and even the deacon under certain conditions. The Synod of Elvira enacted: "Apud presbyterum, si quis gravi lapsu in ruinam mortis inciderit, placuit agere poenitentiam non debere, sed potius apud episcopum; cogente tamen infirmitate necesse est presbyterum communionem praestare debere, et diaconum si ei jusserit sacerdos." Can. 32. (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* p. 238.)

a state of unconsciousness until the boy's return, and then waking told him to make haste and do what the priest had directed. The instructions were followed, and after the old man had swallowed a little of the sacrament he passed away.

"I had ordered," Dionysius explains, "that persons at the point of death, if they asked for it, and particularly if they had previously made request, should receive remission, that they might depart in good hope."[1]

It would appear, therefore, that communion was regularly given, not only to the martyrs and to those that lived in momentary expectation of being called out to witness, but to all Christians as the last pledge of fellowship with the Church, and as a preparation for their departure; for at an earlier date than the time of Dionysius Origen seems to have had in mind a settled custom as he wrote of those "who sup with the Lord in the last day of this life."[2]

The universal character of the practice will become apparent during the course of our review of material illustrating various points in connection with the use of

[1] "Σαραπίων τις ἦν παρ' ἡμῖν πιστὸς γέρων, ἀμέμπτως μὲν τὸν πολὺν διαβιώσας χρόνον, ἐν δὲ τῷ πειρασμῷ πεσών. οὗτος πολλάκις ἐδεῖτο, καὶ οὐδεὶς προσεῖχεν αὐτῷ, καὶ γὰρ ἐτεθύκει· ἐν νόσῳ δὲ γενόμενος τριῶν ἑξῆς ἡμερῶν ἄφωνος καὶ ἀναίσθητος διετέλεσε. βραχὺ δὲ ἀνασφήλας τῇ τετάρτῃ προσεκαλέσατο τὸν θυγατριδοῦν, καὶ 'μέχρι τίνος,' φησίν, 'ὦ τέκνον, με κατέχετε; δέομαι, σπεύσατε, καί με θᾶττον ἀπολύσατε, τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μοί τινα κάλεσον.' καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν πάλιν ἦν ἄφωνος. ἔδραμεν ὁ παῖς ἐπὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον· νὺξ δὲ ἦν, κἀκεῖνος ἠσθένει. ἀφικέσθαι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἐδυνήθη, ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης, τοὺς ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι, ἵν' εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται, βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἔδωκεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ, ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτῃ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστάξαι. ἐπανῆκεν ὁ παῖς φέρων· ἐγγύς τε γενομένου, πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀνενέγκας πάλιν ὁ Σαραπίων, 'ἧκες,' ἔφη, 'τέκνον; καὶ ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτερος ἐλθεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη, σὺ δὲ ποίησον ταχέως τὸ προσταχθέν, καὶ ἀπάλλαττέ με. ἀπέβρεξεν ὁ παῖς καὶ ἅμα τε ἐνέχεε τῷ στόματι καὶ μικρὸν ἐκεῖνος καταβροχθίσας εὐθέως ἀπέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. ἆρ' οὐκ ἐναργῶς διετηρήθη καὶ παρέμεινεν, ἕως λυθῇ, καὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐξαλειφθείσης ἐπὶ πολλοῖς οἷς ἔπραξε καλοῖς ὁμολογηθῆναι δυνηθῇ." (*H.E.* vi. 44.)

[2] *Comment. in Johann.* tom. 32, 2. "οἶμαι γὰρ ὅτι οἱ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δειπνοῦντες καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ βίου τούτου ἡμέρᾳ μεταλαμβάνοντες σὺν αὐτῷ τροφῆς δέονται μὲν καθαρσίου τινός, οὐ μὴν περί τι τῶν πρώτων τοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, σώματος." (Brooke, *Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel*, II. p. 149.)

The context suggests that he is speaking of Christians in general, not merely of the original disciples.

the sacrament. It may here suffice to refer to the language of two rather early Liturgies, in which the association of the Eucharist, under the term *ἐφόδιον*, with the end of life, witnesses to the established practice of the Church.

The Prayer of Fraction, in the *Liturgy of St. Basil*, contains the passage: "Grant unto our last breath worthily to receive the portion of Thy hallowed gifts, as *ἐφόδιον* of life eternal, for an acceptable defence before the awful Judgement Seat of Thy Christ."[1]

Similarly, but with less explicit mention of the end of earthly existence, the Prayer of Thanksgiving in the *Liturgy of St. Mark*, after allusion to reception of the sacrament, continues: "Grant us to partake also of the Holy Body and the Precious Blood of Thine only-begotten Son . . . as *ἐφόδιον* of eternal life, for an acceptable defence," etc.[2]

[1] ". . . δὸς ἡμῖν μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ἡμῶν ἀναπνοῆς ἀξίως ὑποδέχεσθαι τὴν μερίδα τῶν ἁγιασμάτων σου εἰς ἐφόδιον ζωῆς αἰωνίου, εἰς ἀπολογίαν εὐπρόσδεκτον τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ φοβεροῦ βήματος τοῦ χριστοῦ σου. . . ." (Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 410.)

[2] ". . . χάρισαι ἡμῖν τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ . . . εἰς ἐφόδιον ζωῆς αἰωνίου, εἰς ἀπολογίαν εὐπρόσδεκτον κ.τ.λ." (Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient. Coll.* I. p. 146.)

CHAPTER II

A. Official Distribution from the Public Celebration of the Liturgy

IT must remain doubtful whether in apostolic times any provision was made at the Eucharist for those who were absent for sickness, or for any other cause, from the Liturgy; but, with the growth of the Church and the development of eucharistic ideas, the custom of distributing the sacrament became very general. Here we have to do with a wider use than *viaticum*; with a constant and regular practice, that once formed part of the usual rites of the Church.

For some time after the establishment of monarchical episcopacy in the second century only one mass was normally said on each of the days liturgically observed, and that by the bishop. Not only the sick and the prisoners, but those who were hindered otherwise, would have no opportunity of communicating unless the sacrament in some form were specially ministered to them.

For the sake of arranging our material so as to include all the circumstances in which the need for such provision might arise, we may say that three ways were open to the Church by which the needs of those who were not present at the liturgical synaxis might be satisfied.

1. The consecrated elements might be sent from the public celebration of the Liturgy.

2. The Eucharist might be celebrated in a private house to provide communion for those who could not attend the synaxis.

3. Provision might be made for reserving the Eucharist for distribution whenever it was required.

The division proposed is a little arbitrary. The method of distribution during or immediately after the public service would lead on almost insensibly to the habit of reservation; since in cases where it was impossible or inconvenient to carry forth the sacrament at once (as

might often happen during the persecutions) some temporary mode of reserving would be inevitable. Nor, again, is it easy to draw a clear distinction in all cases between distribution from the public performance of the Liturgy and communion at celebrations of a more or less private character, especially in the days before the Church possessed public buildings of her own.

Justin Martyr († A.D. 165) is the first and most important authority for this mode of supplying the sick and others with the Eucharist. He gives two outline accounts of the Liturgy; in one he describes the weekly worship of the Christians, in the other, the mass after baptism. Let us take first his description of the Sunday service. "On the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time allows. Then, when the reader has finished, the president in an address gives instruction, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise and pray; and, as we have said above (*i.e.* in the account of the baptismal mass), when our prayers are ended, bread is brought (to the president) and wine and water; and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his power, and the people assent, saying Amen. And distribution to each takes place and participation in the (elements which have been) dedicated with thanksgiving (ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων); and there is a sending forth to the absent by the hands of the deacons."[1]

The duties of the deacons are more explicitly stated in the description of the baptismal mass. After the consecration, "those whom we call deacons distribute to each of those present that they may participate in the Bread and Wine and Water that have been dedicated with thanksgiving; and they also carry thereof to the absent."[2] The deacons, then, minister both species of the

[1] *Apologia* i. 67. ". . . καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται." (Blunt, *Apologies of Justin M.*, p. 101.)

[2] *ibid.* 65. ". . . οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι." (*op. cit.* p. 98.)

sacrament to the congregation—a practice that persisted after the days of Justin Martyr; but a more important point in the present discussion is the question whether they carried out both species from the synaxis. Certainly, the sense of the passage just quoted is that those who were not present received that which was given to the communicants at the public service—namely, the Bread and the mingled Cup that had been consecrated.

In the same way the account of the Sunday Eucharist speaks of the distribution of τὰ εὐχαριστηθέντα to present and absent alike, after explicit mention of the elements of both species. "This food (τροφὴ)," Justin explains, "we term the Eucharist, and no one may partake of it but he who believes our doctrines to be true, and has been baptized and lives as Christ has enjoined."[1]

It is clear from the context that τροφὴ means *alimentum*, food and drink; and there is, therefore, no evidence here for communion of the absent in one kind alone.

On the other hand, it might be contended that Justin is writing a deliberately *naïve* account, and not a technical description, and therefore omits certain details as to the customs usual among Christians.

We certainly have no means of knowing how the species of Wine, if both kinds were actually employed, was conveyed abroad; whether it was kept separate from the Bread or whether intinction was ever practised at this date. Possibly the early hour at which the Sunday mass was celebrated may have made an unostentatious conveyance of the Chalice practicable; and, if this were the case, there were good grounds for Justin's silence on the point in the *Apology*.

Apart from these well-known passages we seem to have little early information as to this method of providing for the communion of the absent and the sick. Perhaps a closer search through the lives and acts of the saints might bring other evidence to light.

About a hundred years after Justin (A.D. 257), one

[1] *ibid.* 66. Immediately following the sentence previously quoted: "(. . . τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.) καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρόν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ χριστὸς παρέδωκεν." (*op. cit.* p. 98.)

Tharsitius or Tarcisius was slain as he was carrying the sacrament. Pope Damasus I († A.D. 384) has celebrated his martyrdom in verse which tells how he chose rather to lose his life than surrender the holy sacrament of Christ that he bore.[1] His death is chronicled in the *Martyrology of St. Ado*, a ninth-century document; and from this we learn that when he was asked by certain heathens what it was that he bore, disdaining to "cast pearls before swine," he refused to tell. He was done to death by blows of clubs and stones, but when his assailants came to search his body they were unable to find any trace of the sacrament.[2] Of course, he may have been carrying the Eucharist for his own private use, but he is termed *acolythus* in the *Martyrology*, and the title to the poem of Pope Damasus calls him a deacon. He was therefore perhaps engaged in distributing the sacrament officially.

Nor can we certainly learn whether he had with him one or both species. If the detail of the fruitless search made on his person represents what actually took place, it is natural to suppose that he swallowed the sacred element, and that it was not borne in any kind of vessel. Probably, therefore, he was carrying the Host by itself.

There were parts of Christendom where the distribution of the sacrament to the absent continued to be the custom at Easter as late as the fourth or fifth century.

The Syriac version of the *Testament of our Lord*, as edited by the Uniat Patriarch of Antioch, Ignatius Ephraem II Rahmani, contains the rubrical direction—"If any one of the faithful remain at home on account of sickness the deacon shall take him the sacrifice."[3]

[1] *Carmen* 35.

"Tarsicium sanctum Christi sacramenta gerentem,
cum male sana manus premeret vulgare profanis,
ipse animam potius voluit dimittere caesus. . . ."
(Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dict. d'Archéol.* ii. 174.)

[2] *St. Adonis archiepisc. Viennensis Martyrolog.* (August 15th). "Eodem die Tharsitii acolythi et martyris. Quem pagani cum invenissent Christi corporis sacramenta portantem coeperunt discutere quid gereret. At ille indignum judicans porcis prodere margaritas, tam diu fustibus ac lapidibus mactatus est, quousque exhaleret spiritum. Et revoluto ejus corpore, sacrilegii discussores nihil potuerunt in ejus manibus vestimentisque invenire sacramentorum Christi." (*P.L.* cxxiii. 331, 332.)

[3] *Testament. domini nostri Jesu Christi* (1899), p. 141. "Si quis fidelium morbi causa domi maneat, diaconus ipsi deferat sacrificium." In the Coptic

Moreover, if a woman is unable to be present at the Liturgy, the same document provides that a deaconess shall carry the sacrament to her from the open communion.[1] This is for the paschal communion, celebrated in the early hours of Easter Day.

Although this official distribution did not long continue to be part of the regular rite, it was at all times a convenient mode of administering the sacrament to those who were absent from the Liturgy. We find it reappearing from time to time in circumstances where it was the most obvious method to pursue.

For example, we read in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (cent. v) that a monk named James, before retiring into deep solitude in order to escape a severe temptation, begged his friend, the abbot Phocas, to bring him the communion in forty days' time. When the term was accomplished, Phocas either celebrated for this particular purpose, or else set aside a portion of the sacrament at the Liturgy in the coenobium, and took the communion with him to the place of retreat. Here he found the monk half dead; and, to administer the sacrament, he was obliged to force asunder the jaws of the unconscious man and pour the Eucharist into his mouth.[2] The language used suggests that it was administered in a conjoint form.[3]

Again, when, in the sixth century, the civil law concerned itself with the regulation of Christian worship, and forbade the celebration of the Liturgy in private houses and oratories, permission was given to the female inmates

version, the corresponding direction is, "Si vir vel mulier fideles nequeant prae morbo venire ad ecclesiam, deferat mysteria ad illos presbyter vel diaconus" (p. 141, note).

A priest is appointed to take the sacrament to another priest who lies in sickness. "Si vero presbyter est, qui nequit (ad ecclesiam) venire, presbyter illi (communionem) deferat" (p. 143).

[1] *op. cit.* p. 143. "Si mulier praegnans, aegrotet . . . et si nequit accedere (ad ecclesiam), diaconissa ad ipsam deferat communionem."

The commentator sums up: "Eucharistici sacrificii ea nocte oblati omnes sive praesentes sive absentes debebant participes fieri suscipiendo sacram communionem. . . . Quod attinet ad decumbentes, presbyter ad presbyteros, diaconus ad ceteros, et diaconissa ad mulieres eucharistiam communionem deferebant." (*op. cit.* p. 201.)

[2] *Apophth. Patrum* φ. (*P.G.* lxv. 443.) See the story of St. Mary of Egypt, p. 109.

[3] "καὶ ἐνέχε ἃ τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος."

of religious establishments in Constantinople and elsewhere to select a priest or deacon to bring them the sacrament from the Liturgy at the district church.[1]

It is in the peculiar conditions of the religious life that we come across most later instances of communion of the sick, coincident with, or immediately subsequent to, the open communion, inside the monasteries. No simpler way could possibly be devised of providing for the sick inmate who was too ill to be carried into the church. Bede has a story that illustrates this custom. A child in the monastery at Selsey fell ill during a pestilence. As he lay a-dying, he had a vision of the Apostles Peter and Paul, who bade him ask for *viaticum*. A three days' fast was being observed by the monks on account of the pestilence, and during this period no masses were celebrated. But after the boy had told his vision, in which the cessation of the plague was announced, the brethren assembled in church, mass was said and a portion of the sacrament was taken to the dying child.[2]

St. Dunstan in the tenth century gives full directions for the unction and communion of a sick monk. He is to receive the sacrament daily from the morrow-mass of the convent; it is to be brought with some considerable ceremony and administered to him in the concourse of all the brethren.[3] Many instances of this sort might be added.[4]

[1] Justinian, *Novellae.* 123; 36: "Femines autem quemcumque ipsae elegerint, sive presbyterum sive diaconum, ad faciendum eis responsum, aut sanctam eis communionem portandam, sanctissimus episcopus sub quo sunt deputet, quem rectae fidei et vitae bonae esse cognoverit."

[2] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 14: ". . . missas fieri atque omnes communicare more solito praecepit (presbyter), simul et infirmanti puero de eodem sacrificio dominicae oblationis particulam deferri mandavit." (*Baedae Opera Hist.* I. pp. 234, 235.)

[3] *Concordia Regularis* (*P.L.* cxxxvii. 50): "Frater autem ille infirmus si senserit suam crevisse imbecillitatem indicetur hoc conventui a fratre illius custode; ex eo ergo quotidie, post matutinalem missam, sacerdos casula exutus cum reliquis illius ministris missae eucharistiam ferentes, praecedentibus cereis et thuribulo, cum omni congregatione, eant ad visitandum infirmum canentes psalmos paenitentiales, consequente letania et orationibus ac unctione olei prima tantum die: demum communicetur. Quodsi infirmitas levigata fuerit, intermittatur hoc; sin alias, prosequatur visitatio usque ad exitum."

[4] *e.g.* Geraldus, *Vita S. Stephani Muretensis*, eleventh century; "Quinta die dolore invasus, in oratorium positus, finita missa, post sacram

It would seem, too, that masses were said at almost any hour of the day, if there were a sudden need for the sacrament. A celebration for the purpose of providing *viaticum* sometimes took place after compline,[1] and at a time when the Eucharist was universally reserved, the occasional lack of the reserved sacrament brought in the necessity for reverting to a celebration to furnish the *viaticum*. When St. Herluin, founder and first abbat of Bec, lay at the point of death, the brethren sent to fetch the reserved sacrament, but to the consternation of all, they found the pyx empty. It happened that a priest was saying a mass for the dying man's necessities, and held in his hands the Host that he had just consecrated; and a portion of this served for the saint's last communion.[2]

But the practice was not confined to religious houses. Queen Ælfgifu, or Æthelgifu, writing to Dunstan, instructed him just before her death to make all necessary preparations for that event, and to bring her *viaticum* from the mass he was to celebrate the following morning.[3] And if she ought to be reckoned as almost inside the circle of the religious life—for she lived hard by Glastonbury in a cottage that she had had built for herself—this is not

unctionem et receptionem corporis et sanguinis domini . . . migravit ad dominum." (Boll. *AA.SS.*, February 8th.)

[1] Odo Cluniacensis, *Vita S. Geraldi Auriliac.* († *c.* 909): "Tum vero completorium finiens, signo se sanctae crucis armavit. Quidam de sacerdotibus missam concitus celebravit atque sacrosanctum mysterium attulit. . . . Tum vero dominicum corpus quod expectabat sua sponte suscepit. . . ." (*P.L.* cxxxiii. 694.)

[2] *Vita S. Herluini*: "Denique jam ingruentem mortis horam sentiens, communicari se expostulavit, et animam sibi commendari. Festinate ivit abbas Rogerus, sed nullam in eucharistia invenit hostiam; turbati sunt patres universi, mors instabat, et salutare dominici corporis quod ille acciperet non erat. . . . Forte tunc sacerdos quidam pro eo missam celebrans sumendum adhuc in manibus tenebat corpus dominicum; ejus itaque oblationis, quae pro commendando illius exitu oblata deo fuerat, praedictus abbas portionem manu suscepit et ei ad viaticum tulit." *P.L.* cl. 711. *Eucharistia* is a mistake for *eucharistiale*; cf. p. 214.

[3] *Vita S. Dunstani* (B): "Tibi, autem, quasi singularis amicae ministro id operis impono, ut tu quoque mane mature mihi facias balneas accelerare, et funerea vestimenta quae mecum sum habitura praeparare, postque corporis lavationem missas celebrare et mox tempore participationis sacri sanguinis corporisque domini nostri Jesu Christi communionem accipere, ut sic eodem momento viam universae nationis, domino ducente, incedam." (*Memorials of St. Dunstan* (R.S. 63), pp. 19, 20.)

the case with the Empress Matilda of Germany († A.D. 968). The Bishop of Mayence, who ministered to her in her last hours, heard her confession and absolved her; went into church to celebrate; returned and, repeating the absolution previously given, administered unction and communicated her with the sacrament consecrated at the mass that he had just finished.[1]

It was thus too that King Louis VI "the Fat" († 1137), was houselled;[2] and, although we have no biographies from this time of other folk than princes and ecclesiastics or religious, it seems reasonable to suppose that to provide for the necessities of invalids lying not far from the church the celebrant would often set aside a portion of the Eucharist and carry it immediately after service to the sick man. "And when a sick man is to be anointed," so runs an early mediaeval rubric, "let the priest say mass for him; and when all are gathered together let him come with a portion of the Lord's Body and Blood, which the deacon shall carry."[3] So they go straight from the altar to the sick-room, with a portion of the Eucharist consecrated at the mass that has been said immediately before.

[1] *Acta B. Mathild. Imp.*: "Finita missa, rursus intravit (Episcopus) cubiculum et iterando dedit illi remissionem peccatorum: postmodum perunxit eam oleo sacro et recreavit sacrosancto corporis et sanguinis Christi mysterio." (Boll. *AA.SS.*, March 14th.)

[2] *Vita*: ". . . humillime flexis genibus ante sacratissimum corpus et sanguinem domini nostri Jesu Christi (qui enim mox celebraverant, illuc ei cum processione devote attulerant) in hanc oris et cordis verae et catholicae confessionis vocem, non tanquam illiteratus, sed tanquam litteratissimus theologus erumpit 'Ego peccator Ludovicus confiteor. . . .' 'Cum autem cunctis admirantibus facta primum peccatorum confessione devotissime corpori et sanguini Jesu Christi communicasset. . . .'" (*P.L.* clxxxvi. 1337, 1338.)

[3] Mart., *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. art. 4 ordo 13 (a tenth-century (?) Sacramentary of Narbonne). "Dum autem unguendus est infirmus, celebret pro eo missam sacerdos. Deinde convenientibus omnibus, veniat et ipse cum portione corporis et sanguinis domini quam portet levita. . . ." This *ordo* may have had a monastic provenance. The Host was intincted.

CHAPTER III

B. Private Celebrations of the Liturgy

EVIDENCE for the existence of private celebrations for the sick and others in the first age of the Church appears to be lacking. Indeed, such a practice would seem to be opposed to the primitive and universal principle of the one Eucharist in the one local church, and contrary to the apostolic conceptions of unity, expressed in the one Loaf and the one Cup, so prominent in early literature dealing with the Eucharist and eucharistic doctrine.

At a rather later period, the greatest dangers and difficulties did not hinder Cyprian's presbyters from offering in the prisons for the confessors,[1] and the Christians of Alexandria kept their Easter festival under all manner of inconveniences and hardships,[2] but in such cases the social element was not absent; there was always a congregation, the local representative of the Catholic Church, to take its part in the Liturgy.

And besides the social conception of the Eucharist, there were other circumstances that would tell against private celebrations as a regular custom. Of these, the fact that in many parts of Christendom only certain days of the week were liturgically observed must be reckoned as important.

When we do begin to meet with allusions to private celebrations in Christian literature it is not always possible to draw a distinction between those which refer to cele-

[1] *Ep.* 5. See pp. 12, 13.

[2] Euseb. *H.E.* vii. 22. "πρῶτον μὲν ἡμᾶς ἤλασαν καὶ μόνοι πρὸς ἁπάντων διωκόμενοι καὶ θανατούμενοι ἑωρτάσαμεν καὶ τότε, καὶ πᾶς ὁ τῆς καθ' ἕκαστον θλίψεως τόπος πανηγυρικὸν ἡμῖν γέγονε χωρίον, ἀγρὸς, ἐρημία, ναῦς, πανδοχεῖον, δεσμωτήριον." cf. *Acta S. Luciani presbyteri Antioch. Mart.* Jussit suo pectori imponi signa divini mysterii . . . et preces peregit consuetas. Deinde cum divina plurima esset effatus, et sacro ritu omnia peregisset proposita, ipse et fuit particeps sacramentorum, et transmisit ad eos qui aberant. (Boll. *AA.SS.*, January 7th, iv. 14.)

brations for the sake of the sick, and those which refer to masses said in oratories.[1]

There are naturally instances where a mass was said to meet some special need, and a private celebration was the only possible means of giving communion.

So when St. Barlaam had baptized Joasaph, son of the King of India, he celebrated the Eucharist in a bedroom, in order to communicate him.[2]

The story in which this incident occurs is a sort of religious novel, but it bears witness to current practice. There would be no room for doubt in what Uranius relates of St. Paulinus of Nola († A.D. 431) if we could be sure of the authenticity of the narrative. "And when he was about to set out to meet the Lord, he bade the sacred mysteries be performed beside his bed, so that he might commend his soul to the Lord, in offering the sacrifice, along with the holy bishops"—*i.e.* Symmachus and Acindynus who had come to visit him.[3] This was early in the fifth century.

Possibly, too, it was a sick call that took St. Ambrose

[1] This applies to the times when Christians were at liberty to possess and use ecclesiastical buildings. Recourse was still had to private houses in times of danger. "εἰ μὴ δυνατὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προϊέναι διὰ τοὺς ἀπίστους, κατ' οἶκον συνάξεις, ὦ ἐπισκόπε. . . ." (*Const. Apost.* viii. 34.)

For an example, cf. *Acta Marcelli Papae*, 5, "Beata Lucina rogavit S. Marcellum episcopum, ut domum ejus ecclesiam consecraret. Quod cum omni devotione fecit B. Marcellus episcopus. At ubi frequenter in eadem domo missas celebrasset in media civitate via Lata. . . ." Marcellus died a martyr in or about A.D. 319. The *Acta* are given in Boll. *AA.SS.*, January 2nd, pp. 369–373.

The earliest form of this incident is to be found in the *Liber Pontificalis*. "Matrona quaedam nomine Lucina, vidua . . . suscepit beatum virum; quae domum suam nomine beati Marcelli titulum dedicavit, ubi die noctuque hymnis et orationibus domino Jesu Christo confitebatur." (Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* I. p. 164). No mention is here explicitly made of celebrating the Eucharist.

[2] St. John Damascene, *Barlaam and Joasaph*, xix. 167–168. "ἐπανελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ κοιτῶνα, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἐπιτελέσας μυσταγωγίαν τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας, μετέδωκεν αὐτῷ τῶν ἀχράντων τοῦ χριστοῦ μυστηρίων. . . ." (Woodward and Mattingley, p. 283.) There were other purposes for which private celebrations were offered in houses, *e.g.* to rid a place of evil spirits. (August. *De Civitate Dei* xxii. 8.)

[3] Uranii *Epistola*: "Et quasi profecturus ad dominum jubet sibi ante lectulum suum sacra mysteria exhiberi; scilicet ut una cum sanctis episcopis oblato sacrificio animam suam domino commendaret." (*P.L.* liii. 860.)

across the Tiber to say mass in the house of a distinguished lady, though he may have gone there to celebrate for her household in the domestic chapel. The incident is related in the biographical letter sent by Paulinus to St. Augustine (*c.* A.D. 400). He is not explicit on this point, for the incident is merely alluded to in the course of a story that narrates the miraculous healing of a paralytic woman by St. Ambrose, on his way thither.[1]

St. Gregory Nazianzen used the phrase ὑπὸ μόνης ἐρρώνυντο τῆς λειτουργίας in describing the last illness of his father (A.D. 374). It may mean that he had the Liturgy celebrated privately in his bedroom, but the passage is obscure, and may equally well refer to an act of spiritual communion.[2]

Celebrations of a private sort were least unusual in the desert. The lives of the solitaries furnish instances of priests visiting hermits and celebrating for them in the cells. In the *Verba Seniorum*, for example, we are told of a presbyter from one of the city churches who went out into the desert that he might consecrate the oblation for the hermits' communions.[3] Rufinus also tells of John, a solitary of the Thebaid, who ate nothing except the eucharistic Bread. This he received every Sunday at the hands of the priest who made it his business to come and celebrate for him.[4]

[1] *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 10. "Per idem tempus cum trans Tiberim apud quandam clarissimam invitatus sacrificium in domo offerret." (*P.L.* xiv. 30.)

[2] *Orat.* xviii. 38. *Gregor. Theolog. Opera omnia.* (Benedict. Ed. (1778), p. 358.)

[3] *Verba Seniorum*: "ad quemdam solitarium venit presbyter cujusdam basilicae ut consecraret ei oblationem ad communicandum." (*P.L.* lxxiii. 911.) cf. *Apophthegmata Patrum*, where it is related of the Abbot Mark the Egyptian: "εἶχε δὲ ἔθος ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν ἁγίαν προσφοράν." (*P.G.* lxv. 303.)

[4] *Hist. Monachorum*, 15: "cibum vero nunquam sumserat nisi die dominica. Presbyter enim tunc veniebat ad eum et offerebat pro eo sacrificium, idque ei solum sacramentum erat et victus." (*P.L.* xxi. 434.)

Parallels are to be found in the lives of mediaeval ascetics. Matthew Paris has a story of a Leicester recluse who for seven years before her death tasted nothing but the communion she received on Sundays (*Chron. Maj.* (*R.S.*), iii. 101). A number of such instances, from the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, are given by Bridgett, *Hist. of H. Euch.*, p. 238.

At a much later date we find similar arrangements made for the mediaeval hermit and anchoress.[1]

It is perhaps worth while to note that there occurs in the metrical Life of St. Cuthbert a possible allusion to private celebration, but the artistic form of the statement precludes any certainty on the point.[2] The prose *Life* says simply that he received the Body and Blood of the Lord, without any hint of a private service.

Yet undoubtedly masses said in the presence of the invalid for the purpose of providing *viaticum* were not unknown in the Middle Ages in religious houses and elsewhere. St. Dunstan, when he lay dying, gave command that mass should be said in his chamber, and so received his *viaticum*.[3] According to Martène, who has much information on this subject, communion was provided in this way in certain parts of Spain as late as the sixteenth century.[4]

Turning to liturgical sources of information, we take note that provision for masses in private houses, with or without explicit mention of sickness, is made in some early sacramentaries.

The Gelasian Sacramentary, under the title, *Item orationes ad missas*, has a series of prayers for use at a mass in a private house,[5] three of which reappear in the *Missale*

[1] *e.g. Vita S. Godrici*, 97, 98. (Surtees Society, xx, pp. 208, 209.)

[2] "Ast ubi flammicomos ardescens lucifer ortus
Attulit, ecce sacer residens antistes ad altar
Pocula degustat vitae, Christique supinum
Sanguine munit iter . . ."
(Giles, *Complete Works of Ven. Bede*, i. p. 28.)

[3] According to the *Life*, written by Osbern (*R.S.* vol. 63, c. 44, p. 125): "jubet sanctae communionis mysterium ante se celebrari; quod cum protensisque manibus de coelesti mensa porrectum suscepit. . . ." This is confirmed by a similar statement in the biography of which Adelard was the author (*u.s.* p. 66), "Viaticum sacramentorum Christi coram se celebratum," but the contemporary *Life* (B) says nothing on this point.

[4] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. iii. art. v. n. 12.

[5] Sickness is not referred to in any of these prayers:

"Protector in te sperantium deus, et subditarum tibi mentium custos, habitantibus in hac domo famulis tuis propitius adesse dignare: veniat super eos speratae a te benedictionis ubertas, et pietatis tuae repleti muneribus, in tua gratia et in tuo nomine laeti semper exultent. Per.

"Protector fidelium deus, et subditarum tibi mentium frequentator,

Vesontionense, i.e. Mabillon's *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*,[1] and in other documents. Fuller material is supplied in the Moissac Sacramentary, including an Epistle (*St. James* v. 13–16) and a Gospel (*St. Luke* vii. 2–10), a prayer *super oblata*, and others. Moreover, definite mention is made of sickness apart from the implication of the special Gospel and Epistle.[2]

But it is no exaggeration to assert that celebrations of the Liturgy of a private kind, such as we are considering, must be regarded as in some sense abnormal. The mind of the Church has ever been against the promiscuous offering of the Eucharist, in places other than its public buildings, and apart from the assembly of the faithful. This became apparent as soon as Christians began to have any temples of their own.

About the end of the fourth century we begin to meet with expressions of disapproval in regard to celebrations in private houses.

St. Basil, for example, replies to the question, May the oblation (προσκομιδὴ) take place in a common house, by arguing that, since the Logos (by which term he means our Lord) forbids common vessels to be carried through the temple, holy things may not be brought into a common

habitantibus in hac domo famulis tuis propitius adesse digneris; ut quos nos humana visitamus sollicitudine tu divina munias potestate. Per.

"*Secreta.* Suscipe domine, quaesumus, preces et hostias famulorum tuorum, et muro custodiae tuae hanc domum circumda; ut, omni adversitate depulsa, sit hoc semper domicilium incolumitatis et pacis. Per.

"*Infra actionem.* Hanc igitur oblationem (domine) famuli tui Illius quam tibi offert pro votis et desideriis suis, atque pro incolumitate domus suae, placatus suscipias deprecamur: pro quo in hac habitatione auxilium tuae majestatis deposco, ut mittere ei digneris angelum tuum sanctum, ad custodiendos omnes in hac habitatione (consistentes). Per.

"*Postcommun.* Omnipotens sempiterne deus, qui facis mirabilia magna solus, praetende super hos famulos (tuos) degentes in hac domo spiritum gratiae salutaris; et ut complaceant tibi, deus, in veritate tua, perpetuum cis rorem tuae benedictionis effunde. Per.

"Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, insere te officiis nostris, et in hac manentibus domo praesentiae tuae concede custodiam; ut familiae tuae defensor, et totius habitaculi hujus habitator appareas. Per." (Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, lxxiii. pp. 284, 285.)

[1] Neale and Forbes, *Ancient Lit. Gallican Church*, p. 326. (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* I. p. 364.)

[2] Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. art. iv. ordo xi.

house. And, again, just as the apostle teaches that it is not right to eat and drink in the church, so the Lord's Supper ought not to be brought into contempt by being celebrated in an ordinary dwelling; and therefore he only permits it in case of extreme necessity.[1] Whoever wrote the work *De baptismo*, once reckoned among St. Basil's writings,[2] was of the same opinion; and St. Cyril of Alexandria contended that the Liturgy should be performed nowhere else than in the churches of the orthodox.[3]

Moreover, the councils of this period made clear that the offering of the sacrifice in private dwellings was irregular, and prohibited the continuance of the habit. It was laid down at the Council of Laodicea (dated by Hefele-Leclercq between A.D. 343–381) that neither bishops nor priests might offer in houses.[4] The Council of Gangra, of even more uncertain date than Laodicea, but belonging to the middle of the fourth century, forbade all religious services apart from the regular meetings at the synaxes of the Church,[5] and a council held at Carthage (*c.* A.D. 390) prohibited presbyters from celebrating in private without the express permission of their bishop.[6] Nothing is said about the special case of the sick in any of these instances.

[1] *Regul. Brev. Tract*, cccx. "Εἰ χρὴ εἰς κοινὸν οἶκον προσκομιδὴν γίνεσθαι." After the exegesis indicated in the text above, "Ἐξ ὧν παιδευόμεθα μήτε τὸ κοινὸν δεῖπνον ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, μήτε τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐν οἰκίᾳ καθυβρίζειν, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐν ἀνάγκῃ ἐπιλέξηταί τις καθαρώτερον τόπον ἢ οἶκον ἐν καιρῷ εὐθέτῳ." (*P.G.* xxxi. 1304.)

[2] *De baptismo* II. viii. 2. (*P.G.* xxxi. 1602.)

[3] *Adversus anthropomorph.* 12. "Τὸ δέ γε δῶρον, ἤτοι τὴν προσφορὰν, ἣν τελοῦμεν μυστικῶς, ἐν ἁγίαις ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χρὴ προσφέρεσθαι μόναις, καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρωθί που, ἢ τοῦτο δρῶντες παρανομοῦσιν ἐμφανῶς." (*P.G.* lxxvi. 1097.)

[4] *Can.* 58. "ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις προσφορὰς γίνεσθαι παρὰ ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* I. 2. p. 1025.)

[5] *Can.* 6. "εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάζοι . . . μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω." Aimed against the Eustathians, a puritanical sect who had scruples about the marriage of clerks. (Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.* p. 1035.)

[6] *Can.* 9. ". . . in quibusdam locis sunt presbyteri qui aut ignorantes simpliciter, aut dissimulantes audaciter, praesente et inconsulto episcopo, complurimis in domiciliis agent agenda; quod disciplinae incongruum cognoscit esse sanctitas vestra. . . . Ab universis episcopis dictum est: quisquis presbyter inconsulto episcopo agendam in quolibet loco voluerit celebrare, ipse honore suo contrarius exsistit." (Hard. i. 950.) cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* II. i. p. 78.

These enactments, as well as the disapproval of the writers of this period, were called forth, of course, by the prevalence of heresy, schism, and intrigue. The locally-developing independence of the presbyterate may have played some part in influencing the decrees of the councils, for it was very necessary at such a time to relate everything done in the Church's name with the bishop as the centre of local ecclesiastical authority. It is important to remember this in forming an opinion as to the origin of constant reservation of the sacrament under official control; for, although the case of the sick might be regarded as exceptional, methods of supplying their needs that did not involve private celebration were likely to be favoured.

Passing by all reference to oratories[1] and private chapels, which are to be regarded as churches for limited congregations, and which fall therefore outside our subject, the early Middle Ages bring us to a time when the relation of the diocesan to the estate and parish churches had to be defined. Councils and synods carefully guarded the bishop's rights, and retained the offering of the Eucharist entirely under his control.[2]

One or two examples of this legislation are worth notice. There were wealthy and powerful laymen who used to induce the clergy to come and celebrate for them in their houses, where often enough no suitable provision was made for the performance of the service.[3] "We are informed," so runs a canon of some Gallican synod or other held before the end of the ninth century,

[1] The civil law of the Empire decreed on this point: "omnibus interdicimus magnae hujus civitatis (Constantinople) habitatoribus . . . in domibus suis habere quosdam quasi orationum domos et in his sacra celebrare mysteria." (Justinian, *Novellae* 57. tit. 13.)

Thiers (*Exposition*, p. 31) supposed that the oratories of episcopal residences in early times were used for reserving the sacrament. Perhaps he had in mind the definition of *sacrarium* in Ulpian (*Digest.* I. viii. 9): "locus in quo sacra reponuntur: quod etiam in aedificio privato esse potest."

[2] For examples of such legislation cf. *Statuta S. Bonifacii*, II. 2. (Hard. iii. 1943); *Excerptiones Egberti Eborac.* cap. 9 (Hard. iii. 1963); *Capitulare Theodulfi Aurelianen.* cap. 11 (Hard. iv. 911); *Herardi Turonen. Capit.* cap. 34 (Hard. v. 452). There are many others.

[3] Imperial authority again concerned itself with the question at this time. "Ut in diebus festis vel dominicis omnes ad ecclesiam veniant, et non invitent presbyteros ad domos suas ad missas faciendas." (Charlemagne, *Capitulare* 25 (A.D. 789). *Capit.* i. 64 in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*)

"that certain of the laity command the clergy to sing mass for them at home; and in the midst of hounds and harlots, the holy mysteries are defiled rather than consecrated."[1]

Even where some sort of decency was preserved, either by the use of a room set apart for the purpose or by some other means, this promiscuous offering of the Eucharist could not be tolerated.

Of course, a great deal of this legislation has no immediate reference to the case of the sick; but, as in earlier times, the general prohibition of private celebration could not be without effect upon the methods employed for the purpose of administering clinical communion. Indeed, though exemption might be granted in instances of extreme necessity,[2] the case of the sick is sometimes definitely considered and disallowed.

"Some priests offer the sacrifice in unconsecrated places, that is to say, in parlours and bedrooms, for the sake of the sick; and this is forbidden altogether," was the ruling of a decree of the Council of Metz (A.D. 888).[3]

We may sum up by remarking that the instances of private celebration for clinical communions are greatly outweighed by the constant attitude of disapproval toward the performance of the Liturgy elsewhere than in a consecrated building.

[1] "Dictum est nobis quod quidam laici in domibus propriis praecipiant presbyteris missas cantare, et inter canum discursus et scortorum greges sanctitatis mysteria polluantur magis quam consecrantur." (Regino, *Notitiae*, cap. 132.) Ed. Wasserschleben, p. 83. (*P.L.* cxxxii. 218.)

[2] Two English canons of the tenth century allow celebrations in private houses in case of great necessity: can. 25 of Canons of Ælfric: "They (*i.e.* the holy fathers) also established that no one should celebrate mass within any house, unless it were hallowed, except for great need, or if any one be sick." (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, p. 445.) Can. 30 of the series enacted under King Edgar: "And we enjoin that no priest celebrate mass in any house, but in a hallowed church; unless it be for any one's extreme sickness." (*op. cit.* p. 398.) A *Law of the Northumbrian Priests* fines the priest who celebrates in an unconsecrated house (*op. cit.* p. 417), and takes no account (explicitly) of circumstances that might excuse him. (No. 13. Liebermann *Gesetze*, i. 381.)

[3] *Can.* 9. "In locis vero non consecratis, id est, in solariis sive in cubiculis propter infirmos vel longius iter a quibusdam presbyteris sacrificium offerebatur: quod omnimodis interdictum est." (Hard., *op. cit.* vi. 412.)

CHAPTER IV

C. The Eucharist Reserved Privately

So far we have discussed two of the three possible expedients for communicating the sick and dying. There yet remains the third alternative, where the need is met by reservation of the Eucharist; and this, the most important of all three, now claims our attention.

Since grounds exist for believing that reservation of the sacrament appeared first as a private habit, the various forms of the private custom will be considered before we pass on to an examination of the origin and history of official reservation.

It will be most convenient to review the history of this custom among the laity, the religious, and the clergy separately. This order is the natural one, because it was for the sake of the laity that the practice was introduced, and, in the earliest references to private reservation, it is the layfolk that are concerned.

But, before examining these passages, some attempt may be made to determine at what date we may expect to meet with evidence for the existence of the habit.

Reverting then to Justin's account of the Christian rites, we observe that it bears an air of studied reticence and simplicity. He seems to tell as much as, and no more than, he deems necessary to disarm imperial suspicion. It was needful, he thought, to clear the grave misunderstandings that existed as to the nature of Christianity; and he believed that right-minded pagans could be convinced of the innocuous character of the new religion. So he gives a brief outline of the principal rites that were already known to the heathen in a garbled form, but makes no mention of details that it seemed inadvisable to divulge.

If this estimate of his purpose is right, it is possible that private reservation may also have been in use as well as the official distribution which he describes, and he may have purposely omitted any reference to the custom.

Let us test the worth of this assumption.

In the first place, it is hardly likely that private reservation arose out of the regular distribution of the sacrament by the deacons; for there is no reason to suppose that any interval occurred between the conveyance of the Eucharist to the absent and the consumption of the elements. Much of the significance of the rite would have been lost if reception had been delayed. The purpose of the practice was to secure the participation of all the faithful in the one Eucharist: it was in no sense a private communion, but rather a local extension of the public service, as nearly coincident with the open communion as might be. Immediate consumption, therefore, would be regarded as desirable.

For this reason we may believe that the mode of procedure would be the same as that which was in vogue at the communion in the synaxis: that the deacon would immediately himself administer the sacrament to the absent with whatever form or ceremony was usual at the Liturgy.

We may conclude, then, that even if communicants were at this date in the habit of taking away the sacrament from the Liturgy, instead of consuming it at once, such a custom must have had an independent origin, and could not well have had its origin in their familiarity with the delayed reception of the eucharistic species borne by the ministers to the absent.

Further, if we suppose that Christians were already allowed to convey the sacrament to their homes, it is difficult to see why other means of distribution were employed, for there were obvious advantages in the less ostentatious method during those dangerous years. It is certainly unlikely that the two customs coexisted for any great length of time or over any considerable area.

It is probable, therefore, that the habit of private reservation came into general use after the time of Justin. We are really in search of circumstances, operating fairly constantly during a period posterior to the middle of the second century, under the stress of which modifications of earlier practices would be likely to arise and private reservation supplant the official distribution of the Eucharist: this is not a difficult quest.

After the era of the apologists the recurrent persecutions were directed against Christianity as a well-known religion: the offence lay in being a Christian.

Again, the numbers of the faithful were rapidly growing, especially in the larger cities of the empire. It would become increasingly difficult for the officers of the Church to convey the sacrament to all the sick and to the Christian prisoners that at times thronged the gaols, even if the State had not made the profession of Christianity, to all intents and purposes, a capital offence. The regular distribution from the Liturgy by the deacons was bound to fall into disuse when ecclesiastical officials had become the chief objects of the persecuting tyranny.

The Christians doubtless kept themselves well informed as to the habits and dispositions of the local authorities, and would watch carefully for occasions when vigilance was relaxed or persecuting activity diminished. Prudence would dictate that all the members of a Christian household should not assist at the same time at the Church's services; and a very natural consequence of these periodic reigns of terror would be the secret distribution of the sacrament by those who had been able to elude the vigilance of the Imperial police. Not only would the sick be thus supplied, but the sacrament would be conveyed in this way to others as well.

Moreover, whenever the danger grew more imminent, the desire for communion was naturally increased. Frequent, and, in some places, even daily, communion became a very general rule. Under such conditions as then existed the desire for frequent reception could not easily be satisfied by any other means than by communion at home. And yet another circumstance must be taken into account,—the fact that at this period only certain days of the week were liturgically observed; so that altogether a situation was created for which the almost inevitable solution lay in private reservation. These considerations point to the beginning of the third century as the date at which this custom became usual.

From these prefatory remarks we may turn to discuss some early references to the practice as it existed among layfolk, with a view to confirming this conclusion and to ascertaining the extent and duration of the habit.

PRIVATE RESERVATION BY THE LAITY

A passage in St. Clement of Alexandria has sometimes been quoted as referring to private reservation, but the context is against such an interpretation.[1]

It is doubtful, too, whether Origen can be claimed as a witness for the practice. Three passages from the Homilies supposed to contain allusions to the custom are adduced by the editors of *Reliquiae Liturgicae Vetustissimae*. Since these Homilies are extant only in a Latin version the texts have no great value.

In the *Homilies on Exodus*, Origen remarks—"You who are accustomed to attend the divine mysteries know with what care you receive the Lord's Body and with what reverence you preserve (*servatis*) it, lest a little thereof fall, lest any portion of the hallowed gift be dropped. You would justly hold yourselves guilty if this should happen through carelessness; and so, if you rightly take such great care for the preservation (*conservandum*) of the Lord's Body, why do you hold it less of a sin to behave with negligence toward the Word of God than toward His Body?"[2] This reads more like a reference to reverent reception of the Eucharist in church than to private communion at home.

In an exposition of the mystical significance of the Hebrew sacrificial system there may possibly be some faint traces of allusion to reservation; but, if this be so, he appears to disapprove of the practice. "Our Lord," he says, "when He gave the Bread to His disciples, saying, 'Take, eat,' did not bid it be kept (*servari*) until the morrow." "And this is another figure of the sacraments, that whatever remains over to the next day is commanded to be eaten, and nothing must be kept until

[1] *Strom.* I. i. 5. ". . . καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τινὲς διανείμαντες ὡς ἔθος αὐτὸν δὴ ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν." Dindorf, II. p. 6. The reference is to public performance of the Liturgy.

[2] *Hom.* xiii. *in Exod.* 3, "Volo vos admonere religionis vestrae exemplis: nostis qui divinis mysteriis interesse consuestis quomodo cum suscipistis corpus domini cum omni cautela et veneratione servatis, ne ex eo parum quid decidat, ne consecrati muneris aliquid dilabatur. Reos enim vos creditis et recte creditis, siquid inde per negligentiam decidat. Quod si circa corpus ejus conservandum tanta utimini cautela et merito utimini," etc. (*Rel. Lit. Vetust.* I. p. 116. no. 1146.)

the third day."[1] The immediate reference in these two passages is to the law of the peace-offering and of the free-will offering, on which the author allegorizes, as is his wont, and he is really concerned with the "spiritual" offering of praise. This, he says, must never be allowed to grow stale.

The Hippolytan Church Order gives directions as to the care of the sacrament, presumably when privately reserved. It is received before any food. It must be kept from unbelievers, from mice and other animals, and not allowed to drop on the ground and perish. Similarly the chalice must not be spilt.[2] At the same time Tertullian witnesses to private reservation. He deals with those who had scruples about communicating on the station-days. Christians of that time were usually content with a fast that lasted until the hour of the afternoon at which the Eucharist was offered on these days. But there was a very strong rigorist section at Carthage who regarded this as an incomplete observance and kept the whole of Wednesday and Friday as a strict fast.

Their difficulty lay in the circumstance that they could not attend the Liturgy without communicating, and so they were inclined to stay away from the station-day synaxes. For they held that reception of the Eucharist broke the fast as completely as the partaking of food. Tertullian counsels them thus: "Many think that they may not be present at the sacrificial prayers (on the station-days), because the *statio* would be broken by reception of the Lord's Body. Does the Eucharist, then, break up

[1] *Hom.* v. *in Levit.* 8, "Nam et dominus panem, quem discipulis dabat et dicebat eis, accipite et manducate, non distulit, nec servari jussit in crastinum. Hoc fortasse mysterii etiam in eo quod panem portari non jubet in via et semper recentes, quos intra te geris, verbi dei panes proferas." (*op. cit.* p. 118. no. 1174.)

"Alia sane sacramentorum figura est, qua jubet etiam in altera die quod superfuerit edi, nihil vero in tertiam diem reservari, de qua suis locis videbimus." (*ibid.* no. 1175.)

[2] "Omnis autem fidelis festinet antequam aliquid aliud gustet eucharistiam percipere . . . festinet non infidelis gustet de eucharistia, aut ne sorex aut animal aliud at ne quid cadat et pereat de eo . . . calicem . . . acceptisti quasi antitypum sanguinis Christi quapropter nolite effundere. . . ." (Hauler, *Didasc. apost. fragm.* p. 117.) Some parts of this have survived in the Canons of Hippolytus, c. xxviii. (ed. Achelis, p. 205).

the worship that belongs to God, or does it bind the more closely to Him? Will not your *statio* be all the more solemn if you have stood at God's altar? By receiving and reserving the Lord's Body, both points will be secured; namely, participation in the sacrifice and the discharge of your duty."[1] That is to say, they are to attend the station mass, and if they wish to prolong the fast they may take away the sacrament to their homes and consume it after the *statio* is over.

Tertullian refers to the sacrament privately reserved in another place, where he considers the case of a Christian woman married to an unbeliever. "Will your husband know what it is that you taste in secret before (eating) any food?" he asks. "And if he knows it to be bread, does he not think it to be what it is called? And will any one, not knowing the reason of these things, endure them without murmuring? without wondering whether it be bread or a charm?"[2] He also witnesses to the care necessary in reserving, so that none of the sacrament be allowed to fall, though this would apply equally to public reception in Church.[3]

He may also allude to private communion from the reserved Eucharist in his reflections upon the impropriety of a man who has married again performing certain religious acts. He is speaking of the laity. "Are not even we laymen priests? . . . Accordingly, where the clergy are not present, you offer and baptize and are a priest, all alone, for yourself. . . . If you are a *digamus*, do you dare to baptize? Do you, a *digamus*, offer?"[4] This

[1] *De oratione*, 19. "Similiter et de stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit, accepto corpore domini. Ergo devotum deo obsequium eucharistia resolvit? An magis deo obligat? Nonne sollemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram dei steteris? Accepto corpore domini et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii et executio officii." (*P.L.* i. 1181 ff.)

[2] *Ad uxorem*, II. 5. "Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes; et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur (*i.e.* will he not think it to be bread and nothing more)? Et haec ignorans quisque rationem simpliciter sustinebit sine gemitu, sine suspicione panis an veneni?" (*P.L.* i. 1296.)

[3] "Calicis aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur, *De corona.* 3.

[4] *De exhortat. castitatis.* 7. "Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est: regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes deo et patri suo fecit. Differentiam

occurs in the *Exhortation to Chastity*, a work of markedly anti-clerical character; yet in spite of the general tone of the treatise, we can hardly suppose that Tertullian, even in his Montanism, means that a layman may so far usurp sacerdotal functions as to celebrate the Eucharist. It is safer to take *offerre* as meaning the distribution of the sacrament among the members of a Christian household.

From St. Cyprian we learn that special receptacles were employed for reserving the sacrament privately. He is the authority for the oft-quoted story of a lapsed Christian woman who tried to open the vessel (*arca*) in which she kept the Eucharist for her own use. A miracle is said to have deterred her presumption, for supernatural flames burst from the *arca*.[1]

Another writer of the same period, whose work, *De spectaculis*, was once attributed to Cyprian, condemns in vigorous terms the conduct of unworthy Christians who went straight from the Liturgy to the degrading public shows, carrying

inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus et, offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres ecclesia est, licet laici. . . . Igitur si habes jus sacerdotis in temetipso ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis ubi necesse sit habere jus sacerdotis. Digamus tinguis? digamus offers? Quanto magis laico digamo capitale est agere pro sacerdote cum ipsi sacerdote digamo facto auferatur agere sacerdotem!" (*P.L.* ii. 922.) See Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 78 n.

[1] *De lapsis*. 26: ". . . cum quaedam arcam suam in qua domini sanctum fuit manibus indignis tentasset aperire, igne inde surgente deterrita est ne auderet attingere." (*P.L.* iv. 486.) He goes on to tell another tale of the same sort, but here it is more probable that what happened took place at the open communion: "qui et ipse maculatus, sacrificio a sacerdote celebrato, partem cum caeteris ausus est latenter accipere, sanctum domini edere et contrectare non potuit, cinerem ferre se apertis manibus invenit." (*ibid.*) This and other passages are referred to by some of the older ecclesiologists as containing allusions to private reservation, on the strength of the occurrence of the verb "*accipere*." They understand the word in a pregnant sense as meaning "to take and carry away," where, as a matter of fact, the allusion is merely to reception in the hand at the public service (*e.g. De bono patient.* 14: ". . . nec post gestatam eucharistiam manus gladio et cruore maculatur"; *De lapsis*. 22. ". . . et quod non statim domini corpus inquinatis manibus accipiat"). Although they were well aware that the ancient custom was to receive the Bread in the hand, it would not form part of their mental image of the communion. Hence this misinterpretation of "*accipere*." (See *e.g.* Angelus Rocca, *Thesaurus Pontific.* I. p. 40, and Morinus, *De Sacr. Ordin.* III. xii. 3. §§ 5–7.)

the Eucharist with them, and so exposing the Lord's Body to contact with all manner of obscenity.[1]

The danger of irreverence was at a minimum when Christian men and women went with their lives in their hands, but whenever the pressure of persecution was relaxed and the profession of Christianity made less demands upon its adherents, the possibility of irreverent or careless or superstitious use of the sacrament became very real. The bulk of the Church was recruited from the lower middle classes of the Empire, who before their conversion were living in a "daemonic" atmosphere; and however heartily a man might renounce the service of pagan deities, he could hardly escape the modes of thought that were the outcome of his previous mental environment. Hence, we are not surprised to find the Eucharist treated as a charm, an amulet, a medicine.

Even St. Ambrose sees nothing reprehensible in the use of the sacrament as an amulet. In the funeral sermon that he preached on the occasion of the death of his brother Satyrus, he mentions that Satyrus, who was then a catechumen, finding himself once in danger of shipwreck, asked some fellow-passenger, whom he knew to be a Christian, for the sacrament, and, wrapping it up in his scarf, plunged with it clasped to his bosom into the sea.[2] St. Augustine has no adverse comment to make on the action of a woman who before his days used the Eucharist to cure her son of blindness.[3]

[1] *De spectaculis*, 5. ". . . ausus secum sanctum in lupanar ducere, si potuisset, qui festinans ad spectaculum dimissus e dominico et adhuc gerens secum ut assolet Eucharistiam inter corpora obscoena meretricum Christi sanctum corpus infidelis iste circumtulit, plus damnationis meritus de itinere quam de spectaculi voluptate." (Ed. Hartel, III. p. 8. *P.L.* iv. 784.)

[2] *De excessu fratris* i. 43: "Qui priusquam perfectioribus esset initiatus mysteriis in naufragio constitutus, cum ea qua veheretur navis scopuloso illisa vado et urgentibus hinc atque inde fluctibus solveretur, non mortem metuens, sed ne vacuus mysterii exiret e vita, quos initiatos esse cognoverat, ab his divinum illud fidelium sacramentum poposcit; non ut curiosos oculos inferret arcanis, sed ut fidei suae consequeretur auxilium. Etenim ligari fecit in orario et orarium involvit collo, atque ita se dejecit in mare, non requirens de navis compage resolutam tabulam, cui supernatans juvaretur, quoniam fidei solius arma quaesierat. Itaque his se tectum atque munitum satis credens, alia auxilia non desideravit." (*P.L.* xvi. 1304.)

[3] *Op. impf. contra Julian.* iii. 162: "Erat apud nos Acatus quidam, honesto apud suos ortus loco: clausis oculis natum se esse dicebat: sed quia

But the abuses of the sacrament that seem to have been most extensive and of long continuance were in connection with the dead. This subject is considered at the end of this section.[1]

It is natural, then, that when the persecutions had become things of the past and the need for private reservation no longer existed, the custom should be discouraged as undesirable, and ultimately be forbidden. Its disappearance was gradual: in some places it was tolerated longer than was the case elsewhere. St. Jerome alludes to private reservation in his time at Rome, in the course of his remarks on the undesirability of communion under certain conditions. He asks how it is that those who feel themselves debarred from attending the services of the Church are conscious of no incongruity in communicating at home?[2]

To the persistence of the custom into the latter half of the fourth century at Alexandria St. Basil bears witness. Some one had written to ask him about daily communion, and whether it was permissible to make private communion

intus sani palpebris cohaerentibus non patebant, medicum eos ferro aperire voluisse, neque hoc permisisse religiosam matrem suam, sed id effecisse imposito ex eucharistia cataplasmate, cum jam puer quinque fere aut amplius esset annorum, unde hoc se satis meminisse narrabat." (Augustine, *Opera*, ed. Benedict. x. 1802.)

[1] Chap. vii. (f).

[2] *Epist.* (xlviii) *ad Pammach.* 15: "Scio Romae hanc esse consuetudinem ut fideles semper Christi corpus accipiant, quod nec reprehendo nec probo: *Unusquisque enim in suo sensu abundat.* Sed ipsorum conscientiam convenio qui eodem die post coitum communicant, et juxta Persium, *noctem flumine purgant*; quare ad Martyres ire non audent? quare non ingrediuntur ecclesias? An alius in publico, alius in domo Christus est? Quod in ecclesia non licet, nec domi licet. Nihil deo clausum est, et tenebrae quoque lucent apud deum. Probet se unusquisque et sic ad corpus Christi accedat; non quod dilatae communionis unus dies aut biduum sanctiorem efficiat Christianum, ut quod hodie non merui cras vel perendie merear: sed quod dum doleo me non communicasse corpori Christi, abstineam me paulisper ab uxoris amplexu, ut amori conjugis amorem Christi praeferam." (*P.L.* xxii. 506.) The statement in the text above gives the general sense, though some details are not quite clear. *Semper* may mean every day, or more probably, from the context, under all circumstances; in any case, private reservation is implied. On the point of daily communion, Gennadius Massiliensis follows Jerome's opinion (*De Eccles. Dogmat.* 53)—"Quotidie eucharistiae communionem percipere nec laudo nec vitupero." He wrote about the end of the fifth century.

in the absence of a priest. His reply is interesting, and may be quoted as an authentic statement of the conditions under which private reservation came into existence, as well as evidence for its survival in certain quarters.

"It is not necessary to point out that for any one to be obliged in times of persecution to take the communion with his own hand, when no priest or deacon (λειτουργός) is present, is not a serious offence; for long-standing custom has found a sanction for the practice in the actual circumstances. All the solitaries in the deserts, where there is no priest, keep the communion by them and partake of it by themselves. At Alexandria too, and in Egypt, each one of the laity, for the most part, keeps the communion at home, and whenever he wishes partakes of it by himself. For, after the priest has completed the sacrifice once and distributed it, he who then received it in its entirety all together, when he partakes of it each time, must believe that he duly takes and receives it from the hand that first gave it. For even in the church, when the priest distributes each portion, he who receives takes it into his complete control, and lifts it to his mouth with his own hand. It comes to the same thing, whether one or many portions at a time are received from the priest."[1] Private reservation, then, equally with the official distribution, is to be regarded as an extension of public communion, and the postponement of consumption is of no importance.

As to the duration of the practice, we find evidence for the persistence of private reservation at a later date in the

[1] *Epist.* (xciii) *ad Caesar. patric.* ". . . Τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς διωγμοῦ καιροῖς ἀναγκάζεσθαί τινα, μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως ἢ λειτουργοῦ, τὴν κοινωνίαν λαμβάνειν τῇ ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ μηδαμῶς εἶναι βαρὺ περιττόν ἐστιν ἀποδεικνύναι, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν μακρὰν συνήθειαν τοῦτο δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων πιστώσασθαι. Πάντες γὰρ οἱ κατὰ τὰς ἐρήμους κοινωνίαν οἴκοι κατέχοντες, ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν. Ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕκαστος καὶ τῶν ἐν λαῷ τελούντων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτε βούλεται μεταλαμβάνει δι' ἑαυτοῦ. Ἅπαξ γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ ἱερέως τελειώσαντος καὶ δεδωκότος, ὁ λαβὼν αὐτὴν ὡς ὅλην ὁμοῦ, καθ' ἑκάστην μεταλαμβάνων, παρὰ τοῦ δεδωκότος εἰκότως μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ ὑποδέχεσθαι πιστεύειν ὀφείλει. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπιδίδωσι τὴν μερίδα καὶ κατέχει αὐτὴν ὁ ὑποδεχόμενος μετ' ἐξουσίας ἁπάσης, καὶ οὕτω προσάγει τῷ στόματι τῇ ἰδίᾳ χειρί. Ταυτὸν τοίνυν ἐστὶ τῇ δυνάμει, εἴτε μίαν μερίδα δέξεταί τις παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως εἴτε πολλὰς μερίδας ὁμοῦ." (*P.G.* xxxii. 484.)

East than in the West, but even there custom varied from place to place.

John Moschus, in the seventh century, speaks of reserving the Eucharist at home as usual in Seleucia, but he explicitly calls it a local custom.

This is the story. A certain wealthy Severian heretic had in his household an orthodox servant, who received, according to the custom of that part of the world, a portion of the sacrament on Maundy Thursday, and, after wrapping it in a clean linen cloth, placed it in a cupboard which he had for his private use. Shortly after Easter, he was sent on business to Constantinople, and left the key with his master, who one day opened the cupboard, and saw what it contained. Being a pious man (in spite of the fact that he was a heretic), he was distressed at the thought that his servant should have forgotten all about the sacred contents of the cupboard, and wondered what he should do; for he might not consume them himself. He determined therefore to wait until his servant returned. But when the *Coena Domini* came round again and the man had not yet come home, he decided that he ought to burn the sacrament. Opening the cupboard he was amazed to find a number of ears of corn, and ran off full of wonder to the bishop of the local church.

As is usual in tales of this kind a large number ot heretics were converted by the miracle.[1]

But the story contains real points of interest. The Eucharist was distributed, apparently, only on Maundy Thursday; for what purpose it is not easy to say. The servant forgot that he had left the sacrament when he went away; but whether he ought to have made his communion with it at Easter, or whether he should have taken it with him on his journey, does not appear. The former supposition has the support of *Testament of our Lord*, a document that may have come from this part of the world; but the distribution of the sacred elements on

[1] *Pratum Spirituale*, 79. "Ἦν τις ἀνὴρ πραγματευτὴς ἐνταῦθα (in Seleucia) πάνυ εὐλαβὴς καὶ πλούσιος, ἦν δὲ αἱρετικὸς τῶν Σεβήρου δογμάτων, ἔχων δὲ πιστικὸν κοινωνοῦντα τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. οὗτος ὁ πιστικὸς κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς χώρας ἔλαβεν κοινωνίαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πέμπτῃ. Καὶ βαλὼν αὐτὴν ἐν μουζικίῳ ἀπέθετο ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀρμαρίῳ. . . . κ.τ.λ." (*P.G.* lxxxvii. 2936.)

Maundy Thursday for consumption at Easter is unusual, and not easily explained.[1]

The same author tells how a heretic found his wife gone to the house of an orthodox neighbour to make her communion, presumably from the sacrament privately reserved, and administered by layfolk. He surprised her in the act of receiving.[2] A good deal of freedom seems to have been tolerated in some parts if the laity were allowed to admit to communion in this way those who had not been regularly received into the fellowship of the Church.

There is one other use of the reserved sacrament to which a passing allusion may be made here, although it touches a point that will call for further notice in another place; namely, what may be styled the "honorific" use of the Eucharist.

Severus of Antioch (A.D. 512–519) sends the oblation to a Count Anastasius, with a letter protesting that the faithful need not trouble themselves as to whether the priest from whom they receive the sacrament be worthy or unworthy, for the communion is always the same.

"See," he writes, "overcome by the fervour and purity of your gracious father's faith, we have sent you the communion or oblation, as seemed to you to be desirable; because while one and the same faith prevails in the holy churches in the East and in those in Egypt, one must reckon the communion also to be one and of the same value, since priests, whatever they may be in their conduct, cannot increase or diminish the sacrament. . . . However,

[1] If he was unable to attend the Easter festival, he would make his communion at home from the reserved sacrament. cf. *Testament of our Lord*, II. § 20. Everybody absent or present was to receive communion at that time. The officials of the church carried it to the sick. (See p. 17.)

[2] *Pratum Spirituale*, 30. The narrative of the heretic after his conversion is as follows: "ἐγὼ, φησὶν, ὅταν ἤμην ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ γυναῖκα εἶχον. Ἤμεθα οὖν οἱ δύο τοῦ δόγματος Σευήρου. Ἐλθὼν οὖν ἐγὼ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου, οὐχ εὗρον τὴν γυναῖκά μου, ἀλλὰ ἀκούω ὅτι ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τὴν γείτονα κοινωνῆσαι. ἦν δὲ κοινωνοῦσα ἐκείνη εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. . . . Εἰσελθὼν οὖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τῆς γείτονος, εὗρον τὴν γυναῖκά μου ἤδη προσφάτως λαβοῦσαν τὴν ἁγίαν μερίδα καὶ κοινωνοῦσαν. Δραξάμενος τοίνυν τοῦ λάρυγγος αὐτῆς ἐποίησα ἐξεράσαι αὐτὴν τὴν ἁγίαν μερίδα. Καὶ λαβὼν ἠκόντησα αὐτὴν ἄνωθεν κάτω. . . . κ.τ.λ." (*P.G.* lxxxvii. 2877.)

as I have said, having been overcome by the abundant love which you have towards Christ, we have done what was commanded by you."[1] This same writer furnishes us with evidence for the existence of this "honorific" use of the sacrament among the religious and the clergy.[2]

It is now time to consider as a whole the evidence that we have collected. The passages adduced seem to permit three conclusions.

First—The origin of private reservation among the laity is closely bound up with the period of persecution that followed the age of the apologists; that is to say, it appears as a common custom at the end of the second century, or the beginning of the third.

It is worthy of remark that we meet with it first in Africa, where a local persecution of a violent kind began in A.D. 197. The opening years of the next century witnessed the outbursts under Septimius Severus, which affected widely separated parts of the empire. Thus Tertullian's familiarity with the custom is accounted for; but as he speaks of the use of the reserved sacrament in times when the synaxes were apparently solemnized in security, and when Christians could inter-marry with their heathen neighbours, we conclude that once the practice had come into existence, it continued in use when there was no very pressing need for it. But this need returned during the Decian and Valerian persecutions, and for this period we have the evidence of Cyprian in Africa, and the testimony of Dionysius at Alexandria.

It is also interesting to note that when the conditions reappear, under which private reservation was first introduced, the practice is revived. We have such an instance in the action taken by Dorotheus, Bishop of Thessalonica, at a time when it would appear that reservation of a private sort, where it existed at all, had become reduced to a very attenuated form, and subserved other ends than those

[1] Brooks, *Select Letters of Severus of Antioch*, II. part 2 (Translat.) p. 231.

[2] *ibid.* pp. 245, 246. "In the case of the religious deacon Misael also, as well as the Christ-loving brothers Ammian and Epagathus, who about two years ago sent me a box and asked me to have it filled for them with the communion or holy oblation, I did not fall in with the impiety and superfluity of the request."

for which it was originally employed. In A.D. 519, his diocese was threatened with persecution, and so he caused a plentiful supply of the sacrament to be distributed for private use, lest any of his people should be deprived of the opportunity of communicating.[1]

Secondly—The practice seems to have been fairly general. Writers from the third century onward allude to it as a familiar custom. The references are not numerous, it is true, but they include Rome, Africa, Alexandria, Syria, and Macedonia. We know from the fact that action was taken to suppress private reservation among the laity by two Spanish councils at the end of the fourth century, that it had reached that part of the world before that date, probably long before; but we have no earlier evidence for its existence there.

Thirdly—The language of the passages in which reference to the custom occurs, taken in conjunction with the conditions under which it first came into being, leads to the conclusion that the laity made use of the species of Bread alone for this purpose.

No great importance ought to be attached to the mere fact that the reserved sacrament is commonly called the Body of the Lord, for Jerome employs the phrase, *corpus Christi accipiant*,[2] in reference to regular communion in both kinds at church, and there is considerable laxity of expression in this particular among early writers on the Eucharist. The mention of the chalice in the Church Order seems to be an afterthought and to refer only to reception in Church. If this is ambiguous, the counsel that Tertullian gave the scrupulous Christians of Carthage clearly implies the use of only one kind in private reservation. If they did not wish to consume the sacrament immediately, they were to receive the Lord's Body and keep it until they thought they might communicate without blame. They would, of course, abstain from participation in the Chalice, for this would involve a breaking of the stational fast quite as much as would the eating of the Bread; and there is no hint of conjoint administration by intinction.

The further passage, that speaks of the reserved

[1] Thiel, *Epp. Roman. Pont.* I. p. 902. "Canistra plena, ne imminente persecutione communicare non possent."

[2] *Epist.* (*xlviii*) *ad Pammach.* 15.

sacrament as Bread (*et si sciverit panem*), puts the matter beyond all reasonable doubt, so far as Africa in the age of Tertullian is concerned.

Beside the one really important point of practical convenience, there were other good reasons why the sacramental Bread alone should have been used in private communion. In Cyprian's day the sect of the Aquarians[1] had begun to substitute water for the mingled Chalice at the early Eucharist, so that the odour of wine in the breath at so early an hour of the day should not arouse the curiosity and suspicion of their heathen neighbours and kin. Any danger of this sort would be obviated if only the one kind were employed for communion at home.

St. Basil, who views the custom simply as a delay in communicating, speaks of receiving one or more *portions* (μερίδες) at once from the hand of the priest. Here, again, only the Bread is taken away and reserved.

The ease with which the sacrament was carried about; the absence of any allusion to the Wine; the use of a box (*arca*) all point to the same conclusion. Details in the other quotations we have given, such as the story of the miracle at Seleucia, where the mention of the ears of corn implies that the sacrament was kept in the form of Bread; and the definite statement about the action of Bishop Dorotheus, confirm the inference that within the limits of the period to which we have so far confined our investigation, the laity reserved the Bread alone for their private use.

Hitherto we have made use of no evidence on this subject beyond the patristic period,[2] but, before leaving this part of our inquiry, it is of interest to note that rare and isolated instances of private reservation by layfolk occur at comparatively recent dates. St. Lewis, in the thirteenth century, is said to have borne the sacrament

[1] cf. *Epist.* 63 *ad Caecilium.* Earlier notice of the practice occurs in Clement Alexand. *Strom.* I. 19.

[2] Wonder stories of the type recorded by such writers as Caesarius of Heisterbach not infrequently presuppose the use (generally unlawful) of the reserved sacrament by layfolk, *e.g.*: "Quando in ista magna expeditione naves ex omni parte Alemanniae congregatae mare intraverunt, ob causas diversas perceptum est sacerdotibus ne in aliqua navi corpus dominicum servaretur. . . ." (Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dial. Monach.* ix. 13.) The misuse of the Eucharist for various dishonest and magical purposes was only too common at this period (fourteenth century).

on his person (by permission of the papal legate) during the crusades.[1]

More remarkable is the statement of Carolus Veranus, a fifteenth-century historian, that Ferdinand of Spain, after being captured by the Moors, left the sacrament with them as a pledge for his return to captivity if he should fail to find ransom.[2]

The custom was not extinct in the East in the days of the seventeenth-century *savant*, Gabriel the Sionite. Martène quotes from a letter of his as evidence for the persistence of private reservation among the Maronites at that date; they bore the sacrament with them into battle, and whenever they undertook a long or perilous journey.[3]

Before we pass on to deal with private reservation among the religious and the clergy, it will be convenient to complete the present section by a few remarks on the suppression of the custom among the laity. We shall then be able to explain the more readily why it survived to some extent in religious and clerical circles to a later date.

A check was imposed on the practice in the West between A.D. 379–381, when the bishops of Spain and Aquitaine sat in council at Saragossa (*Caesaraugusta*) to condemn the errors of the Priscillianists, and promulged a series of eight canons. The third of these forbade communicants to carry the Eucharist away from church.[4] But whether this was for a reason connected with the heresy, or whether it condemned only the *surreptitious* removal of the sacrament[5] are points which remain doubtful.

[1] Guilelmus de Nangiaco, *De gestis S. Ludovici*: "Sacrum domini Jesu Christi corpus secum de licentia domini Tusculani sedis apostolicae legati deferebat." (Mart. *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. v. art. 4. § 1.) Bona, however, says (*Rerum Lit.* I. xv. 6) that St. Lewis had the sacrament reserved on his ship when he was returning from the crusade for the celebration of *Missae Siccae.*

[2] Cited by Rocca, *Thes. Pontific.*, vol. I, p. 41. cf. Surius, *Vitae Sanct.* (August 25th).

[3] Martène, *loc. cit.*

[4] *Can.* 3. "Eucharistiae gratiam si quis probatur acceptam in ecclesia non comsumpsisse, anathema sit in perpetuum." (Hefele-Leclercq, i. 98. 7: Hard. i. 806.)

[5] cf. the story of a woman who pretended to communicate and conveyed the sacrament secretly to her maid, for dishonest purposes, in the

A similar enactment was made a few years later (A.D. 400) by a council of eighteen bishops assembled under the Archbishop of Toledo. "If any one does not consume the Eucharist that he receives from the priest, he is to be expelled as sacrilegious."[1] Here again, although some of the canons deal with ecclesiastical discipline, Priscillianism was the occasion of the council's assembly; but it seems impossible to determine whether or not the prohibition concerning the Eucharist has any direct regard to that heresy.

In the East, where private reservation lingered later than in the West, an early Armenian canon, which belongs to the first part of the fourth century, forbids the private ministration of the Eucharist by the clergy in the houses of laymen except in case of sickness; and this must be held to imply that reservation was not usual in the area where the enactment had force; or else, if it were practiced, it was discountenanced by this decree.

The series of canons in which this occurs bears the name of the Metropolitan Isaac, or St. Sahak (A.D. 390–441).[2]

As to the reasons why private reservation was generally discontinued after a certain date, some have become clear during our examination of the quotations that refer to it. These passages seem to bear out the remarks with which this section opened. It was authorized at first as the only practicable way of supplying the faithful with the sacrament under the persecutions. But as soon as the real need for the custom disappeared abuses of various kinds began to make their appearance. The ultimate result, therefore, was certain to be a curtailment of the liberty conceded to the laity in this matter.

No step, however, was taken for some time. There

time of St. John Chrysostom (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 5, *P.G.* lxvii. 1528f; Nicephorus Callistus, *Hist. Eccl.* xiii. 7, *P.G.* cxlvi. 953).

[1] *Can.* 14. "Si quis autem acceptam a sacerdote eucharistiam non sumpserit velut sacrilegus propellatur." (Hefele-Leclercq, ii. 123: Hard. i. 992.)

[2] *Can.* 13. "And outside the church priests shall not dare to carry the sacrament into the houses of cultivators, and there impart the holiness, except only in cases of sickness." (*Amer. Journ. Theol.*, October, 1898, p. 836.) cf. Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* x. 280.

is no trace of a sudden resolve on the part of the Church as a whole to put an end to the practice. How far the action of the two Spanish councils reflects the general mind of the West, or represents the beginning of a policy, is not easy to ascertain. Probably their ruling is to be explained as due to local circumstances of which we are ignorant. For about the same time Augustine (as we have noted) does not see anything reprehensible in the strange uses to which the Eucharist was sometimes put; and Jerome, although it is obvious that he does not like the practice, has no official expression of disapproval to quote against private reservation among lay people.

A few years later (A.D. 440) Pope Leo I drew the attention of his clergy to the habit of those who were infected with the Manichaean heresy of refusing the chalice at communion;[1] and towards the end of the same century another Pope (Gelasius I) is said to have ordered those who made a practice of abstaining from the sacramental Wine either to receive the Eucharist in its entirety, or to be repelled from communion altogether.[2]

Now, as we have seen reason to believe, private reservation involved the use only of the kind of Bread; and, therefore, any measures that were employed to combat the influence of Manichaeism would indirectly procure the condemnation of any form of communion in which both species were not used.

If we add to these considerations the fact that the frequency of communion was diminishing (in some quarters rapidly) during the fifth and the following centuries we

[1] *Serm. xlii.* (xli). "Cumque ad tegendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse conventibus, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum, ne penitus latere non possint, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiant, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostrae haurire omnino declinent." (*P.L.* liv. 279, 280.)

[2] The decree can only doubtfully be ascribed to Pope Gelasius: "Comperimus autem quod quidam in eadem regione sumpta tantum corporis sacri portione, a calicis sacri cruore abstineant. Qui procul dubio nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi; aut integra sacramenta percipiant aut ab integris arceantur, quia divisio unius ejusdem mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire." (*P.L.* lix. 141.) The apparent ignorance of Manichaeism (*nescio qua superstitione*) is remarkable if this is a genuine fragment of Gelasius. It is included in the *Corpus Juris Canon. Decret.* iii. 2. xii.

have a combination of circumstances in which private reservation would tend to become obsolete among the laity.

Some further legislation that directly or indirectly forbids or limits the use of the reserved sacrament by layfolk will be found noted in the section that deals with the minister of the reserved Eucharist.[1]

[1] Chap. xiv.

CHAPTER V

RESERVATION OF THE EUCHARIST BY RELIGIOUS

THE isolation of the earliest solitaries was so complete and final that they were compelled to forgo all outward fellowship with the rest of the Church. Little is certainly known of their way of living, for neither they nor their contemporaries described it; and later writers who recount the beginnings of Christian asceticism transfer the customs familiar in their own age to the times of which they write. From consideration of their circumstances it seems probable that the first hermits were content to dispense with the sacraments altogether. References to sacramental communion are rare in the original text of the *Lausiac History*,[1] which, as the earliest account extant of the desert-life, preserves certain primitive touches that are overlaid and obscured in the later and more popular literature of asceticism.

If the constant use of the sacraments was not a feature of the earliest desert-life, a more normal type of Christian practice, in which the sacraments had their place, became the general rule when groups of disciples gathered about the cells of famous ascetics, and the *lauras* began to spring up here and there. So it comes about that in the later additions attached to the *Lausiac History*, there is abundance of stories in which the habit of communion is taken for granted.[2] Some of these references to communion occur in simple biographical statements; others, that tell of the miraculous administration of the Eucharist to the primitive solitaries, are important as bearing witness both to the sufficiency of spiritual communion among the pioneers of the movement, and also to the habit of frequent

[1] Butler, *Lausiac. Hist. of Palladius* (*Texts and Studies*, vol. vi, nos. 1 and 2).

[2] Macarius of Egypt regards five weeks as an abnormally long term of abstinence from communion, even for the laity. (Butler, *op. cit.* II. p. 46.)

sacramental communion among the later desert monks. In order to satisfy themselves that those who were followers of the older tradition had not been deprived, in their solitude, of that means of grace which they, under the conditions of coenobitic life, found indispensable, later generations of ascetics told such stories as the following. It is related of St. Macarius of Egypt that when he was engaged in celebrating the mysteries in the chapel of his coenobium—for he was a priest and the leader of a band of disciples—he was accustomed to see at times the fingers of a supernatural hand remove from the holy table a portion of the sacred elements after consecration. Now, according to the story, it was discovered that a solitary named Mark was for three years spiritually and corporeally sustained by the sacrament borne to him by an angel; and this angel used to wait for Macarius to consecrate the Eucharist and then take away a portion from the altar.[1] The circumstances contemplated in this tale are such as were to be found at a time when the new corporate forms of asceticism were gradually displacing the hermits. For some still followed the old paths and lived in isolation; and to provide the neighbouring solitaries with the Eucharist became the concern of the monks at the lauras and coenobia.

In coenobia of the Pachomian type communion on Saturday and Sunday seems to have been the common rule;[2] but the disciples of St. Apollo, or Apollonius, of Hermopolis, are said to have received the Eucharist daily.[3] The same is related of the monks who lived under the direction of the abbot Hor;[4] and in the case of the community over which St. Euthymius presided in the early part of the fifth century a daily celebration in the church

[1] Rufinus, *Hist. Monach.* 2. "Angelus enim dei tertia quaque die escam deferebat ei coelestem, et haec ei cibus erat et potus." (*P.L.* xxi. 106.)

[2] Cassian, *Instit.* iii. 2. (*P.L.* xlix. 115.)

[3] Rufinus, *Hist. Monach.* 7. "Sed et hoc monebat (ut si fieri posset) quotidie monachi communicarent mysteriis Christi, ne forte qui se longe facit ab his, longe fiat a deo." (*P.L.* xxi. 410, 411.)

[4] *ibid.* 2. "Consuetudo autem erat ei non prius corporalem cibum sumere quam spiritalem Christi communionem acciperit. Quo accepto, post gratiarum actionem adhortari nos etiam ad reficiendum coepit." (*P.L.* xxi. 406.) cf. *ibid.* 15. (*P.L.* xxi. 434.)

of the coenobium was the custom.[1] From the Liturgy celebrated at the coenobium distribution might be made to the hermits who lived near at hand; or monks who were in priest's orders would celebrate for the solitaries in their own cells.[2] This often meant a long journey into the desert, to places inaccessible to the clergy of the city or village churches, who themselves would offer the holy sacrifice in the hermitages that were within reasonable distance of their cures.

But as there was for some time considerable hesitation as to whether the ascetic life was compatible with the priesthood the majority of the religious were laymen. If they lived, either singly or in communities, far away from any normal centre of Christian life, and still wished to be supplied with the Eucharist, they would usually be obliged to practise reservation. It seems inevitable that the use of the reserved sacrament should have become very usual, not only among the hermits but also in the little loosely-organized communities that had no priest among their members.

St. Basil, as we have already seen, says that it was the custom of solitaries to communicate themselves, when no priest was at hand, with the sacrament that they kept in their cells for that purpose;[3] and John Moschus has a tale of two stylites, one orthodox, the other a heretic, who exchanged portions of the reserved Eucharist.[4]

The changes that took place in the development of monasticism in the West so greatly affected the practice of reserving the sacrament that it is convenient to follow the persistence of the custom in the East before we turn to the history of its survival elsewhere.

It is interesting to compare with the remarks of St. Basil the answer given by Theodore the Studite, in the ninth century, to the question as to whether monks or nuns might make their communion privately from the reserved

[1] *Vita*, auct. Cyrillo, Boll. *AA.SS.* (January 20th).

[2] *Verba Seniorum*, v. 24 : ix. 11. (*P.L.* lxxiii. 899, 911.) *Apophth. Patrum* (52), etc. (*P.G.* lxv. 304.)

[3] *Epist.* xciii. *ad Caes. Patric.* "πάντες γὰρ οἱ κατὰ τῆς ἐρήμους μονάζοντες ἔνθα μὴ ἔστιν ἱερεὺς, κοινωνίαν οἴκοι κατέχοντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν. . . ." (*P.G.* xxxii. 484.)

[4] *Pratum Spirit.* 29. (*P.G.* lxxxvii. 2877.)

sacrament. He replied that those who were not in Holy Orders may handle the sacred elements only in case of urgent need, and gave directions for the reverent performance of the act.[1] From the tenth century we have the reply made by the Archbishop of Corinth to St. Luke the younger on the same point.[2] The latter of these two passages, if not the earlier also, alludes to the communion of a solitary.

Allatius has preserved certain prescripts of a later date,[3] bearing upon this subject, that were issued by the Patriarch of Constantinople; and even as late as the seventeenth century, according to Arcudius, the Greek monks carried the sacrament about with them when they travelled.[4] Whether this was for the purpose of communicating, or as an amulet, is not stated.

Private reservation, properly so called, among the religious naturally tended to disappear when the solitary ascetic became a member of a community. This was already the case before monasticism had begun to spread

[1] *Epist. ccxix.* "Τιθεμένης βίβλου ἱερᾶς καὶ ἐφαπλουμένης ὀθόνης καθαρᾶς, ἢ ἱερᾶς ἐπικαλυμματίδος ἐκεῖσε τοῦ δώρου ἀπὸ χειρὸς σὺν φόβῳ προτεθέντος, μετὰ τὴν ὑμνῳδίαν ἀπὸ στόματος ληπτέον· εἶθ' οὕτω διακλύσεως οἴνου γινομένης τῷ λαμβάνοντι." (*P.G.* xcix. 485. n. 58.)

[2] *Vita S. Lucae Junioris.* "Primo igitur ac praecipue quidem sacerdotem adesse decet. Quod si ille necessaria omnino ratione desit, imponendum sacrae mensae sive altari praesanctificatorum vasculum, siquidem oratorium sit, sin autem cellula, scamno mundissimo. Tum explicato linteolo propones in eo sacras particulas, accensoque thymiamate typicorum psalmos aut hymnum trisagion cum fidei symbolo decantabis: trinaque genuflexione adorans, manus quidam contrahes, ore autem pretiosum Christi ac dei nostri corpus sumes, dicendo Amen.

"Loco autem sacri laticis, vini poculum bibes. Nec vero huic calicem ministerio addictum in usum communem assumes. Rursus vero reliquas particulas in vase linteolo colliges, omnem diligentiam adhibens ne margarita, id est dominici corporis particula, dilabatur ac conculcetur." (Boll. *A.A.SS.*, February 7th).

[3] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. v. art. i. (p. 250). "Tunc autem divinus panis tingitur cum ex anachoretis aliquis in monte se abdit propter nimium erga virtutem studium avetque saepius sacrorum particeps fieri ob eam quae inde corporis et animae consequetur sanctitatem. Panis divinus in pyxide munda huic delatus divino sanguine intinctus est."

Martène also refers to an ancient MS. of St. Gregory's *Exposition of Ezekiel*, at Weingarten, that bears the remark, "oportet monacho ubicumque exierit eucharistiam secum semper vehat." No date is given. (*ibid.*)

[4] Martène, *loc. cit.*

far beyond the borders of its desert home. The custom of reserving a portion of the Eucharist in a hermit-cell passed into the practice of keeping the sacrament for the use of the community, where there was no priest to say mass for the brethren.

What we might perhaps call corporate reservation seems to be implied in the account that Palladius gives of the enormities committed by Theophilus of Alexandria. Among other crimes he was charged with firing a monastic establishment; and we are told that a boy, much furniture, and the "symbols of the mysteries" were destroyed in the flames.[1]

The conditions that made for the disuse of the private habit were especially prominent in the West, where, from the early part of the fourth century, the development of the religious life was towards an essentially social ideal. In that form it was finally remoulded and fixed by St. Benedict in the sixth century.[2] Only the hermit and the anchoress perpetuated in a modified form the elder tradition.[3]

But there was an area in the Western Church that possessed strong traditions of its own, and for some time resisted the influence of Benedictine ideals and forms. The

[1] *De Vita S. Johann. Chrysost. Dialog.* vii. "συγκαύσας τὰς βίβλους πάσας ἐνδιαθέτους καὶ σπουδαίας καὶ παιδίον ἕν, ὥς ἔφασαν οἱ ἑωρακότες, καὶ τὰ σύμβολα τῶν μυστηρίων." (Chrysost. *Opera*, ed. Gaume, xiii. 26.)

[2] St. Benedict seems to have carried the sacrament on his person; at any rate, he was able to produce it forthwith (*protinus*) on one occasion, when a body would not remain buried until the Host had been laid upon it. (Gregory, *Dialog.* ii. 24. (*Vita S. Benedicti*) *P.L.* lxvi.)

[3] Three features of the religious life in the desert—abstention from communion for long periods and the later customs of private celebrations and of reservation in the cell—are paralleled in the *Vita S. Godrici* († 1170). Neither Godric nor his companion Ælfric heard mass or received communion for some years, until Ælfric died after receiving *viaticum*. During the sixty years that Godric lived at Finchale he only left his cell on three occasions, and these all occurred in the first year that he spent there. He went once to hear mass on Christmas Eve at Durham, and once to make his communion there on Easter Day. Priests came to say mass for him on Sundays and holy days, and towards the end of his life he communicated frequently. For many years the Eucharist was reserved in his cell. See the remarks in Bridgett, *op. cit.* pp. 234–235 and *Vita* in Surtees Soc. Vol. xx.

Celtic variety of monasticism retained, or reproduced, many features of the older and severer Egyptian type; and, in particular, there was no insistence upon the *stabilitas loci*, the fixed abode, that formed so important a feature of the main stream of Western monasticism.

The Celtic monk wandered about from place to place, and took up a temporary lodging from time to time for the purposes of prayer, of mission-work, and of teaching. Sometimes he was alone; more often a band of monks would travel together.

Very frequently the sacrament was carried about as an amulet. Irish monks used it as *coimge conaire*, *i.e.* path-protection, as well as for communicating themselves or others; and the vessel in which it was borne was termed the *chrismal*.[1]

The *chrismal* is often mentioned in the lives of the Irish saints. For example, it is told how St. Comgall, when at work in the fields, laid aside his *chrismal* with his cloak, and how some Pictish robbers, intent on pillaging a *villa*, did not dare to molest the saint when they saw the sacred vessel.[2]

St. Mochoemog wished his *chrismal* and his staff to be buried in the grave of a young man slain by violence, whose body on that account could not be interred inside the boundary-wall of the coenobium.[3]

Dying monks and others received *viaticum* from the

[1] See p. 206.

[2] *Vita S. Comgalli*, 22, "Quodam die, cum sanctus Comgallus esset solus in agro foris operans posuit crismale suum super vestem suam. In illa die gentiles latrunculi multi de Pictonibus irruerunt in illam villam ut raperent omnia que ibi erant, sive homines, sive peccora. Cum ergoe venissent gentiles ad sanctum Comgallum foris operantem, et crismale ejus super capam suam vidissent, putaverunt crismal illud deum sancti Comgalli esse; et non ausi sunt tangere eum latrunculi causa timoris dei sui." (Plummer, *Vitae Sanct. Hibern.* II. p. 11.)

[3] *Vita S. Mochoemog*, 18. "Et volentes corpus humo tradere, beatus Kainnichus dixit ad sanctum Mocoemog: 'Hunc hominem, qui repente occisus est, non debes sepelire inter monachos tuos.' Respondit sanctus Mocoemog: 'Nolo contradicere tibi, pater; sic sepelietur corpus ejus seorsum interim; sed tamen anima ejus coram presencia dei in celo est, et ideo resurrecio eius debet esse inter monachos. Baculus meus et crismale cum isto interim in extremo loco sepelientur; et inde non solventur donec huc corpus Slebyni, qui istum juvenem occidit infideliter, veniet.'" (*ibid.* p. 173.)

sacrament thus reserved. It would serve no useful purpose to give more than a few of the many allusions to this use of the Irish hagiologies. The *sacrifice* or *viaticum* is often desired in expectation of death, and apparently received from a portion borne in a *chrismal*.[1]

When St. Molua was paying a visit to one Cronan he thought he was about to depart from this life, and was given communion by his host. The text, as edited by Plummer, simply says that he received the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; but another version, appended as a footnote, adds that Cronan carried the sacrament on his person.[2]

Of the same saint, when later he actually came to die, it is recorded that immediately before his departure he asked one of his disciples for *viaticum*—"*Igitur da mihi, fili carissime, sacrum sacrificium*," and, after receiving it, he expired.[3]

In the long tale of the wanderings of St. Brendan and his company there is frequent mention of *viaticum*. It is true that the saint regularly says mass in the ship,[4] but in most cases it seems to be implied that the last communion was administered with the reserved sacrament.[5]

This is also the case in the narrative of the death of St. Comgall, who would not receive *viaticum* from the hands of any other than the abbot Fiachra. He, being sent to the dying man, immediately gave him communion —"*dedit statim communionem dominicam*."[6]

The *penitentials* and allied literature abound in allusions to the use of the reserved sacrament by the Celtic monks and clergy. The directions concerning the penances in-

[1] *Vita S. Munnu*, 29, "Pater, da mihi divinum viaticum; jam enim tercia die ad celum migrabo." (*ibid.* p. 238.)

[2] *Vita S. Moluae*, 52, "Et indicans sanctus Molua sancto Cronano obitum suum prope esse, communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi accepit ab eo; et in osculo pacis deinde post orationem et benedictionem lacrimosam inde datam, sanctus Molua ad suum sanctum monasterium, Cluain Ferta, cum suis reversus est." (*ibid.* p. 223.)

The other reading is "postulavit ab eo sacrificium quod secum portaret, et dedit ei Cronanus."

[3] *ibid.*

[4] *Vita Prima S. Brendani*, 56, *op. cit.* I. p. 128. "dum missas celebrarent in nave."

[5] *ibid.* pp. 110, 137, etc. [6] *Vita S. Comgalli*, *op. cit.* II. p. 20.

curred by the loss of the *chrismal* and its contents that are found in the earliest examples of this type of document, such as the *penitentials* bearing the names of Gildas, of Cumean and of Columban, are repeated in practically the same terms in the later groups of *penitentials*. One instance will suffice at this point. The *Penitential of Gildas* prescribes a penance of three quarantines in cases where the sacrifice has been lost and left to be eaten by beasts or birds.[1]

Further references to private reservation by the religious will be found in the chapter dealing with the vessel of reservation, under the heading of *chrismal*.[2] Here it is enough to note that special provision of penances was made for the loss of the Eucharist on a journey, or in case it should be dropped from a boat or let fall over a bridge, or from horseback.[3]

There is in the so-called *Penitential of Bede* a direction that seems to contemplate the use of the reserved sacrament by the laity as well as by religious. All the faithful, it is stated, especially monks, should know how to baptize; and if they are going far afield, they must always take the sacrament with them. The grammatical sense of the passage is that layfolk as well as religious are to carry the Eucharist with them, and apparently not merely for their own use.[4]

As with the laity, so with the religious, private reservation seems at first to have been practised in the one kind of Bread. Whether the Hosts used for this

[1] *Gildas, De Poenit.* ix. "Si casu negligens quis sacrificium aliquod perdat, per iii xlmas peniteat, relinquens illud feris et alitibus devorandum." (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, I. p. 114.)

For similar directions cf. Schmitz, *Bussbücher*. The various groups of *penitentials*, and the collections subsequently made are here set forth. Penances as to the loss of the *sacrificium* or the *chrismal* seem to pass from Irish to English, and thence to Frankish or German collections.

[2] See p. 206. [3] Cummeani, *Lib. de Mens. Penit.* xiii.

[4] The material of this penitential comes from those of Finnian and Theodore, and doubtless from the former of these sources comes the direction to which allusion is made in the text. It is as follows:

42. "Sed et omnibus licet fidelibus ubi forte morituros invenerit non baptizatos, immo preceptum est, animas eripere a diabulo per baptisma, id est benedicta simpliciter aqua in nomine domini, baptizare illos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, intinctos ac superfusos aqua. Unde oportet eos qui possunt fideles, monachos maxime, et scientiam habere baptizandi et si longius alicubi exierint, eucharistiam semper secum habere." (Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* III. p. 329.)

purpose at a later date were ever intincted is a question that must for the present be left open.

USE OF THE RESERVED EUCHARIST AT THE CONSECRATION OF A VIRGIN[1]

For several centuries a peculiar use of the reserved sacrament was in vogue in connection with the consecration of a virgin. It first appears in the mixed *ordo* printed by Hittorp,[2] where the concluding rubric provides that she shall reserve for her communion during the following eight days. There are several features about this *ordo* which itself is subsequent to the blending of Gallican with Roman rites, that come from earlier sources, and of these the ceremony in question may well be one.

There is no such provision made in the Roman form of service appended to the "Gregorian" Sacramentary in Muratori; but it reappears in two of the tenth-century forms included by Gerbert in his *Monumenta*,[3] and is to be found in many orders used in France, from the ninth or tenth century until the fifteenth.[4] Toward the end of this time the period appointed for communion from the reserved sacrament had become reduced from eight to three days; as is ordered, for example, in the Pontifical of John of Saarbrück, a fifteenth-century Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne.[5]

Something of the same sort may have been known in England, for in the service printed by Maskell,[6] three days

[1] See Frere, *Pontifical Services*, I. (Alcuin Club Coll. iii.) pp. 68 ff.

[2] Hittorp, *De div. cath. eccl. ritibus.* (in *Bibliotheca Patrum* of 1624, x. 161). "Deinde publica voce bannum episcopalem imponat, ne quis eam a divino servitio sub vexillo castitatis impediat, ut bona sua cum pace et quiete possideat. Tunc imponatur evangelium, et illa velato capite ad manus episcopi offerat, et missa ordine suo finita communicet. Postquam communicavit reservet de ipsa communione unde usque in diem octavum communicet."

[3] *Mon. veteris liturg. Alemann.* ii. pp. 95–104.

[4] A number are mentioned in Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* II. vi, and included among the orders appended to this section of his work. In one (ordo iv.) communion seems to be delayed until the conclusion of the eight days—"reservent usque in diem octavum et *tunc* communicent."

[5] Martène, *loc. cit.*

[6] *Mon. Rit.* iii. 361. It is a peculiar form of service, and represents the usage of some particular house. See Frere, *op. cit.* p. 78. Six days

of retirement and privacy are prescribed. It is possible that during these days the newly-professed virgin may have communicated in the way described; or, as there is no note of it in the order, the three days of silence may represent a trace of the custom after the actual use of the reserved sacrament has disappeared.

It is tempting to suppose that these periods of retirement and this custom of private reservation are to be associated with memories of the ancient solitary life of a religious. But the beginnings of asceticism among women were very different in their circumstances from the origins of the religious life among men, and the *ordo* in which this custom first appears contemplates the possibility of the virgin remaining unattached to a community, and living a dedicated life in her home.[1]

It also appears that no real affinity exists between this custom and the similar ceremony practised at one time at ordinations of bishops and priests which had an evident origin in concelebration.[2]

silence was observed in the order used by Bishop Fox (*Mon. Rit.* iii. 331 ff.), with no hint of reservation.

[1] Or more correctly, one of the sources of the *ordo* makes this presumption.

[2] See below, p. 65.

CHAPTER VI

PRIVATE RESERVATION BY THE CLERGY

WE have seen how, owing to a combination of circumstances, including local synodical prohibition, the habit of reserving the sacrament came to an end among the laity, at no very distant date after the conditions that were the cause of its coming into use had passed away. And as for the religious, the development of the Benedictine type of monasticism gradually rendered the practice unnecessary in their case, at least so far as the greater part of the West is concerned.

Among the clergy we should expect to find the custom more usual and persistent for a longer period. For a priest has a certain pastoral responsibility in regard to those who cross his path, and he would therefore carry the sacrament about with him, not only for the purpose of communicating himself when he was not able to celebrate the Liturgy, nor merely as a protection against the perils of the way, but also that he might be able to housel, as he travelled, any who asked for his ministrations.

That all these three ends were subserved by the sacrament borne on the person of an ecclesiastic will become clear as we examine a few passages in which some reference to this habit occurs.

Since the religious might be in priest's orders, some of the instances which we have already quoted might equally well find a place here; and as the custom of private reservation by the clergy is complicated by the fact that they are the stewards of the sacraments, it becomes difficult and somewhat artificial to maintain, where the clergy are concerned, a distinction between reservation of a private and of an official sort.

St. Hilary of Poitiers († A.D. 366), writing of the troubles connected with Arianism in Ancyra, tells of the riots that accompanied the return of Bishop Marcellus from Rome, whither he had gone to make a defence of

his opinions, and to try and clear himself of the charge of heterodoxy. His reappearance provoked the same scenes that took place at Alexandria when Athanasius was expelled. The clergy were stripped and dragged into the market-place and the sacrament that they bore suspended about their necks was openly profaned.[1]

We have no means of knowing for what purpose they carried the sacrament on their persons; probably at this date to meet any need that might arise. This took place in or about A.D. 338, when the memory of the persecutions was still fresh, and the contending factions of Christendom had introduced a new source of danger to life and limb.

St. Jerome makes a passing remark about the laudable poverty of Bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse that may allude to private reservation, but the sense is not quite clear. He speaks as if the bishop were accustomed to carry the Lord's Body in a wicker basket, and the Blood in a vessel of glass.[2] Does he mean that this was his habit in ministering to the sick? that he took the *viaticum* to his people in these mean and homely vessels? Or are we to understand that he used to bear about the sacrament in this way for some private purpose of his own?

The former alternative seems to be more in accordance with the context. If this were the sense, it would imply that he made use officially of the reserved sacrament, even if the time during which it was reserved was no longer than was occupied by the completion of the service at which it had been consecrated.

A friend of St. Gregory the Great, Maximian of Syracuse, was able to give communion to his fellow voyagers during a storm at sea. He distributed among them "*the Body and Blood of our Saviour*"; and it is hardly possible

[1] *Fragmenta* III. 9. "Fuere namque et in Ancyra provinciae Galatiae, post reditum Marcelli haeretici, domorum incendia et genera diversa bellorum. Nudi ab ipso ad forum trahebantur presbyteri; et, quod cum lacrymis luctuque dicendum, consecratum domini corpus ad sacerdotum colla suspensum palam publiceque profanabat." (*P.L.* x. 665.)

[2] *Epist. ad Rustic.* (cxxv.) 20. "Sanctus Exsuperius, Tolosae episcopus, viduae Sareptensis imitator, esuriens pascit alios: et ore pallente jejuniis, fame torquetur aliena: omnemque substantiam Christi visceribus erogavit. Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro." (*P.L.* xxii. 1085.)

that Maximian could have said mass in such circumstances.[1] We must therefore suppose that he had the sacrament ready to hand, possibly in both kinds, but not necessarily so.[2]

Another notable passage may be inserted here describing the death scene of St. Ambrose:

"About the time that he went to God, from the eleventh hour of the day until that hour in which he rendered up his spirit, he prayed with his hands spread out in the form of a cross: we saw his lips were moving although we heard no voice. And Honoratus, the bishop of the church at Vercellae, after he had laid himself down to sleep in the upper storey of the house, thrice heard a voice calling him and saying, 'Get up quickly, he is near his end.' So he came downstairs and administered (*obtulit*) the Lord's Body to the holy man: and he, having received and consumed it, gave up his spirit, taking with him a good *viaticum*."[3]

Nothing is said in the narrative as to the source from whence the sacrament was obtained. It may have been brought into the house in view of the illness of St. Ambrose, which lasted several days; or it may be that Honoratus had the Eucharist in his own possession. This is a good instance of the rather numerous class of passages that may be made to mean exactly what the preconceptions with which they

[1] Gregory, *Dialog.* iii. 36: "Tunc in eadem navi residentes non jam ex morte vicina, sed ex ipsa ejus praesentia ac visione turbati omnes, sibimet pacem dederunt, corpus et sanguinem redemptoris acceperunt, deo se singuli commendantes." (*P.L.* lxxvii. 304.)

[2] Occasional reference to the consecrated Bread in terms that imply the presence of both species is to be found at an early date, *e.g.* Eusebius (*H.E.* vi. 43) records the following of Novatian: "ποιήσας γὰρ τὰς προσφορὰς, καὶ διανέμων ἑκάστῳ τὸ μέρος καὶ ἐπιδιδοὺς τοῦτο, ὀμνύειν ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς ταλαιπώρους ἀνθρώπους ἀναγκάζει, κατέχων ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσὶ τὰς τοῦ λαβόντος καὶ μὴ ἀφεὶς ἔστ' ἂν ὀμνύοντες εἴπωσι ταῦτα (τοῖς γὰρ ἐκείνου χρήσομαι λόγοις)· ὄμοσόν μοι κατὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μηδέποτέ με καταλιπεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς Κορνήλιον."

[3] *Vita*, auct. Paulino: "Sed eodem tempore quo migravit ad dominum, ab hora circiter undecima diei usque ad illam horam in qua emisit spiritum, expansis manibus in modum crucis oravit; nos vero labia moveri videbamus, vocem autem non audiebamus. Honoratus etiam sacerdos ecclesiae Vercellis cum in superioribus domus se ad quiescendum composuisset, tertio vocem vocantis se audivit, dicentisque sibi 'surge, festina, quia modo est recessurus.' Qui descendens, obtulit sancto domini corpus: quo accepto ubi glutivit, emisit spiritum bonum viaticum secum ferens." (*P.L.* xiv. 43.)

are read dispose one to expect. Accordingly we find this place employed to support varied opinions.

In the seventh century St. Birinus carried the Eucharist in his pallium from motives of devotion and as a protecting influence against mishaps while travelling.[1]

When St. Boniface drew up a series of instructions for his priests to observe on their mission-journeys, he included an injunction that they should not go afield without chrism and oil and Host, so that they might have wherewithal to attend to the spiritual needs of those whom they encountered.[2]

St. Adalbert of Prague, in the tenth century, used to take away with him, wrapped in a linen cloth, whatever remained of the sacrament after mass, and used it for *viaticum*.[3]

In the Life of St. Lawrence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin († 1181), it is told how four priests openly carried the Eucharist as an amulet. More usually the case or vessel that contained the sacrament was hidden by the dress, though it may have been worn more or less openly at times.[4]

Giraldus Cambrensis says it was the custom of the Celtic priests of his day to take the Eucharist with them on their travels, in a little pouch, concealed beneath their garments.[5]

Such a use of the sacrament continued throughout the Middle Ages. St. Thomas Becket wore a case containing

[1] *Vita*, Surius (December 3rd).

[2] *Stat.* 4: "ut presbyteri sine sacro chrismate et oleo benedicto et salubri eucharistia alicubi non proficiscantur. Sed ubicumque vel fortuitu requisiti fuerint, ad officium suum statim inveniantur parati in reddendo debito." (Hard. iii. 1943.)

[3] "quiquid superfuit de eo quod ipse et novi baptizati communicaverant colligere jubet et mundissimo panno involutam sibi servavit pro viatico deportandum." (*P.L.* cxxxvii. 884.)

[4] *Vita*, 6: "Quadam igitur die in via quam manibus suis beatus Coemgenus construxisse dicitur trans paludes et aquarum scaturigines, dum in suis expectarent latibulis si quos spoliandi opportunitas se offerret, mox quattuor sacerdotes cum magna turba hominum transire noverunt qui eucharistiam, sicut tunc moris erat plurimis presbiteris, secum pro tuto viatico ac securo duce iteneris puplice deferebant." (*Anal. Bolland.* t. xxxiii. p. 134.)

[5] *Top. Hib.* ii. 19: "Perula quam more patriae presbyter itinerans sub indumento a collo suspensam deferebat."

a Host, and was careful to have it with him when he went to meet the King on a notable occasion.[1]

Rocca, relying on Platina, gives the names of certain Popes, beginning with Stephen III (†A.D. 757), who were in the habit of carrying about the Eucharist on their persons.[2]

It is interesting to observe how in time this custom, once practised by Christian people of every degree, comes to be at last the peculiar privilege of the Roman Pontiff.

Angelus Rocca[3] devotes several of the early pages of his work to a description of the ceremonies that accompanied the progress of the Popes. It was their custom to carry the Eucharist themselves, or (this is a later development) it was borne before them in solemn pomp. Rocca gives three illustrations of this latter method. In two of these the Host is borne on horseback in a box fixed to a saddle, and surmounted by a crucifix; under a miniature *ciborium* in one case, under a canopy in the other. In the third illustration a similar receptacle is carried on a bier between two led mules. In all three the Pope rides immediately behind.

Rocca cites a writer of the sixteenth century[4] who describes the coronation of Charles V by Clement VII, and the procession that took place after the ceremony, wherein the sacrament was carried under a golden canopy in a suitable vessel of crystal on the saddle of a blood-horse, with a great number of lights before and around. In this magnificence is enshrined the last vestige of the custom of private reservation.

THE RESERVED EUCHARIST AT ORDINATION

In the section dealing with private reservation among the religious,[5] mention was made of the habit of giving a consecrated Host to virgins at the time of their consecration. A similar custom of different origin was in vogue for two or three centuries at the ordination of bishops and of priests. According to Morinus,[6] the practice began in Italy at some

[1] Cited by Thiers, *Exposition*, p. 8.

[2] *Thesaurus Pontific.* I. pp. 45, 46. He names Stephen III, Stephen IV, Gregory VII, Urban II, Paschal II, Gelasius II, and Alexander III.

[3] *ibid.* I. pp. 45 ff.

[4] Paulus Jovius, *Hist. sui tempor.* § xxvii. in vol. ii. 89 (1552).

[5] See p. 59. [6] *De Sacris Ordin.* iii. pp. 165 ff.

time in the ninth century, and spread thence to other parts of the Church, including the greater portion of Gaul, during the next hundred years. The reason he gives for this statement is that none of the older rituals (of which he instances the *Sacramentary of Ratoldus*, *c.* A.D. 960) that represent the fusion of the Gregorian Sacramentary with Gallican material contain any trace of the rite.

At first it is associated only with the sacring of bishops. This is the case in the *Ordo Romanus viii* of Mabillon's collection. Here it is directed that when the communion is reached, the Pope is to deliver a consecrated obley to the newly-made bishop. He having received it, communicates himself, and retains a portion for his communion during the next forty days.[1] The pseudo-Alcuin knew of this custom in Rome in the ninth century.[2] It was also practised in Spain, for the *Pontificale Conchense* directs that an entire and unbroken Host is to be given to the new bishop, but seems to make the reservation contingent upon a portion remaining unconsumed after he has made his communion: "*if, indeed, any be left over*"[3] is the expression used.

The number of days was reduced to thirty in the tenth-century *Pontifical of Mayence*,[4] and was in the end commuted, about the beginning of the thirteenth century, into an obligation to say mass daily during a fixed period.[5]

[1] "Dum vero venerit ad communicandum dominus apostolicus porrigit ei sacratam oblationem, et eam suscipiens episcopus ipse ex ea communicat super altare, et sibi ceterum ex ea reservat ad communicandum usque ad dies quadraginta; et postmodum ex praecepto domini apostolici communicat omnem plebem." (*Mus. Ital.* II. p. 89.)

[2] *De Divinis Officiis.* (qualiter episcopus ordinetur) in Hittorp. 271.

[3] "Cum venerit ad communicandum domnus pontifex porrigat ei formatam atque sacratam oblationem integram: suscipiensque eam episcopus ipse ex ea communicat super altare. Quod vero si residuum fuerit sibi reservet denuo ad communicandum unoquoque die ad quadraginta dies expletos." (Cited by Mart., *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. viii. x. 21.)

A rubric almost identical with the foregoing is contained in a Salzburg pontifical of eleventh-century date, and in other contemporary documents of the same type, belonging to Rouen, Rheims, and elsewhere. (Mart., *loc. cit.* pp. 54, etc.) So also the thirteenth-century pontifical of the Latin Church at Constantinople. (Mart., *loc. cit.* p. 74.)

[4] Mart., *loc. cit.*

[5] As is ordered in a rubrical note appended to the ordination mass in the pontifical of the Latin Church of Apamea in Syria. "Illud quoque sciendum quoniam ipse consecratus a die suae consecrationis usque ad quadraginta dies, si possibile est sibi, unoquoque die debet cantare missam pro populo sibi commisso." (Mart., *loc. cit.* p. 73.)

The ceremony of taking a Host from the hand of the Pope (who is supposed to celebrate) is retained. "Cum venerit ad communicandum, pontifex porrigit ipsi consecrato sacram oblationem integram, quam ipse suscipiens dat ei osculum." (*ibid.*)

For the existence of the same custom in the ordering of priests, the earliest testimony seems to be that of Fulbert of Chartres. He had been greatly perturbed at the loss of one of the Hosts given to a newly-ordained priest. So he wrote to consult a comprovincial as to whether it was not desirable to curtail the period, during which the sacrament was thus reserved, to one or two days.

This elicited the reply that the custom could not be altered. Not merely was it the habit of the bishops of Gaul to give the presbyters a Host at their ordination, but it was the universal practice of the Church. Fulbert's correspondent also gave the reason why forty days were fixed upon as the term; it was in memory of the forty days that followed the Resurrection of our Lord, in which time He refreshed His apostles "with the sweetness of the Bread of heaven."

We learn from Fulbert's account of the accident that the Host was kept in an envelope of parchment; and that the new priest, when he said mass on each of the forty days after his ordination, used to consume a portion thereof.[1] This relates to the early years of the eleventh century.[2]

[1] *Epist. ad Einard.* ". . . nostro tempore quidam inter caeteros ad sacerdotalem gradum admissus, hostiam quoque sicut et alii de manu episcopi suscepit, quam in pergameno in hos usus parato involutam quotidiana celebratione solvebat, et portiunculam parvam juxta instantium dierum computatam sumebat. Accidit vero ut quadam die expletis mysteriis, dum vestimenta cum sindone altaris incautius colligeret, immemor hostiae sacrae diligentiam nequaquam adhibens thesaurum coelestem infelix amitteret. . . . Hac ergo occasione accepta quaerendum ab episcopo aestimavi si videretur sibi salva ordinis religione sanctificatum panem primo aut secundo sanctificationis die posse totum simul percipere, quem videbat non sine periculo posse tanto tractu temporis minutatim sumere. . . ." (*P.L.* cxii. 192 ff.)

The passage is too long to quote in full.

[2] For other sacramentaries of this and later date see Martène, *op. cit.* A pontifical of Soissons contains the note: "debent presbyteri portiones dominici corporis ab episcopo accipere, de quibus percipiant communionem

Somewhat later, but still in the same century, the term of days is limited to seven in the case of priests;[1] and, says Morinus, "In the year one thousand the practice was very general in Gaul and Italy, but from the middle of that century it began to fall into disuse."[2]

And at last the custom became obsolete. As in the case of bishops, so with priests, an obligation to celebrate daily for a certain time remained after the earlier practice had disappeared.[3]

As to the meaning of the rite, it seems to represent a trace of concelebration,[4] and therefore the resemblance between this custom and that associated with the consecration of virgins is only of a superficial character.

Mabillon[5] surmises that the particles of the reserved

per quadraginta dies, in exemplum domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui quadraginta diebus cum suis discipulis conversatus est post resurrectionem suam." This appears to have been the accepted explanation.

[1] As in the Salzburg pontifical, where bishops still reserve for forty days. "Tollit vero pontifex oblatas integras et dat singulis novitiis presbyteris, et inde communicantur ad usque dies septem." (Mart., *loc. cit.* p. 55.)

[2] *op. cit.* p. 167.

[3] Morinus, *op. cit.* p. 168. "Antiqui rituales excepto antiquissimo et recentiore necnon et edito qui hanc admonitionem praetereunt, adnotant ordinatum septem diebus continuis ad missae sacrificium celebrandum obligari."

[4] A similar relic of concelebration appears in the modern Greek rite for ordering a priest.

A short series of rubrics prescribe that the newly-ordained priest is to receive from the hand of the pontificating bishop the "holy Loaf," which he returns at the time he makes his communion.

"Ὅτε δὲ τελειωθῶσι τὰ ἅγια, καὶ μέλλει εἰπεῖν, ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσι, προσέρχεται ὁ χειροτονηθεὶς, καὶ ἐπιδίδωσιν αὐτῷ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον, λέγων οὕτως, λάβε τὴν παρακαταθήκην ταύτην, καὶ φύλαξον αὐτὴν, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτε παρ' αὐτοῦ μέλλεις ἀπαιτεῖσθαι αὐτήν. Ὁ δὲ λαβὼν, ἀσπάζεται τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ μεθίσταται ἐν ᾧ πρότερον ἵστατο τόπῳ, τὰς μὲν χεῖρας θεὶς ἐπάνω τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, καθ' ἑαυτὸν δὲ λέγων τὸ κύριε ἐλέησον, καὶ τὸ ἐλέησόν με ὁ θεός.

"ὅτε δὲ μέλλει εἰπεῖν, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις· τότε ὁ χειροτονηθεὶς ἀποδίδωσι τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως μεταλαμβάνει πρῶτος τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ λέγει καὶ τὴν ὀπισθάμβωνον εὐχήν." *Euchologion.* cf. the direction in the pontifical of Apamea II (note, p. 66) to receive the Host, where no mention is made of its reservation.

The remarks of Morinus (*op. cit.* p. 167) are worth consulting on this point, but he apparently makes the newly-ordained receive a portion of the Host itself (*sanctum panem, hoc est particulam panis consecrati*).

[5] *Mus. Ital. II.* (*Comment. in ord. Roman.*) p. xxxix.

Host were placed day by day in the chalice by the newly-ordained celebrant, but unless we suppose that the description that is given by Fulbert implies such a use of it, there does not seem to be any evidence for this statement. It is also to be observed that the species of Bread alone appears to have been employed, and not an intincted Host. At this date conjoint communion was the usual way of administering the Eucharist to the people. But the higher orders of the clergy received the sacrament in the two kinds separately, and we have no reason to suppose that the Host used in this ceremony was in any way different from that which clerks normally received in communion.

The private reservation of the Eucharist by the clergy, especially for the purpose of giving extra-liturgical communion, brings us to the point where reservation acquires a regular and official character. We may accordingly take leave of the private customs, and now pass on to consider what may be called, for want of a better term, official reservation.

But before we discuss reservation of this description, that has as its aim a regular provision for the satisfaction of the needs of the sick and dying, we have first to take note of certain authorized practices, which must be borne in mind as we seek to determine the origins of the official custom.

CHAPTER VII

Peculiar Uses of the Reserved Eucharist

SOME reference must first be made to three very similar uses of the reserved Eucharist that are known as the *Eulogiae*, the ceremony of the *Fermentum*, and that of the *Sancta*. Of these the last two are liturgical observances, while the first was apparently a very primitive extra-liturgical practice.

A. The Eulogiae

Bishops of neighbouring and occasionally of distant dioceses were accustomed to send the Eucharist to each other, and even to each other's clergy, especially at Eastertide, with messages of charity and goodwill. For this reason the consecrated portions so sent were termed *Eulogiae*.

That the Eucharist itself was used for this purpose is clear from the earliest mention of the custom. In the letter of St. Irenaeus to Pope Victor, in which he pleads for the maintenance of communion with the Easterns in spite of the quartodeciman controversy, he reminds the Pope of the example of his predecessors in the see. They, he says, although they did not keep the Eastern rule of Easter, sent the Eucharist to the bishops (πρεσβύτεροι) of other dioceses who did observe it.[1]

A custom that had grown up, no doubt, under such conditions as prevailed in Asia and Syria, where the cities of the empire, and consequently the ecclesiastical units, lay close together in well-marked and limited areas, could not long survive in the new circumstances of diocesan development. We therefore find little evidence for the perpetuation of the custom in the West, where the

[1] *Epist. ad Victorem.* "Ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες, οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν." (From Euseb. *H.E.* v. 20.) (*P.G.* vii. 1229.)

Fermentum, in a manner, replaced it; and in the East it was forbidden by the fourth-century Council of Laodicea.

It was there decreed that the hallowed elements were no longer to be sent as *Eulogiae* into strange dioceses, at the feast of Easter.[1]

Binterim[2] is at pains to prove that the prohibition in the canon is concerned with a custom of sending *un*consecrated obleys from diocese to diocese, and forbids this only at Easter, without condemning the practice at other times of the year. His argument rests on the fact that according to the usage of the Eastern Churches, the term τὰ ἅγια is applied to the breads intended for use in the Liturgy.

This very far-fetched explanation does not take into account the fact that the obleys for use in the Liturgy are termed τὰ ἅγια only by anticipation, in view of the fact that they are destined to be consecrated. The name would not be given to breads which were not intended for consecration. He suggests a second explanation which is equally unsatisfactory, by which τὰ ἅγια are taken to mean the ἀντίδωρα.[3]

But the sense of the canon is quite obvious. The custom of sending the sacrament as *Eulogiae* had, by the time of this council, become restricted to Easter; and even this observance is henceforth to cease. *Eulogiae* are not to be sent beyond the bounds of any diocese. As no mention is made of restriction inside the diocese, this may imply that a bishop might still send *Eulogiae* of this kind to his own clergy; in which case, the *Fermentum* is practically substituted for the earlier custom.[4]

[1] *Can.* 14. "περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὰ ἅγια εἰς λόγον εὐλογιῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα εἰς ἑτέρας παροικίας διαπέμπεσθαι." (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, I. 2. p. 1006.)

[2] *Denkwürdigkeiten* iv. 3. pp. 535 ff.

[3] *Can.* 32 of the same council prohibits the reception of *Eulogiae* of heretics. "ὅτι οὐ δεῖ αἱρετικῶν εὐλογίας λαμβάνειν, αἵτινές εἰσιν ἀλογίαι μᾶλλον ἢ εὐλογίαι."

So Isidore and Dionysius Exiguus try to retain the play upon words by translating *maledictiones* and *benedictiones*.

Reception of heretical *Eulogiae* was forbidden again at Braga (A.D. 572), but by this time the term no longer means the sacrament sent about from place to place; it is used for gifts and greetings, and the *pain bénit*.

[4] Drews (*Zeitschr. f. prakt. Theol.* xx. (1898), pp. 18–38) connects the origin of the *Eulogiae* with the Agape rather than the Eucharist. The

But the honorific use of the sacrament did not entirely disappear. Severus of Antioch, to whom reference has been made before, when asked by his friends to send them portions of the Eucharist from his celebration, sometimes complied with their requests, though not without demur, and at other times refused.[1]

In later times the term *Eulogiae* was used with a variety of meanings. In the Eastern Liturgies it has several senses. It still has the meaning of the consecrated elements in the liturgical allusions of the Fathers;[2] but more commonly it is used in reference to the "blessed bread,"

primitive custom, he says, was for the presbyter to bless portions of bread which were then distributed by the laity among themselves, and also given to the catechumens; this formed the introductory ceremony of the common meal. In course of time the distribution of the blessed bread came to be restricted to the clergy, and catechumens were excluded from the ceremony; so that in addition to the significance of an introductory act at the Agape, the *Eulogiae* acquired that of a token of membership, and a highly-valued amulet. From these interpretations of the meaning of the *Eulogiae* grew up the custom of sending them to friends at a distance and the honorific use to which allusion has been made in the text above.

This contention will not hold. The earlier references to the *Eulogiae* (*e.g.* that in Irenaeus) are at variance with Drews' interpretation. At the same time he is probably right in suggesting that a reference to the custom of distributing "blessed bread" to the catechumens is intended in the remark made by St. Augustine (*de Remiss. peccat.* II. 42 (26)):

"Non unius modi est sanctificatio: nam et catechumenos secundum quemdam modum suum per signum Christi et orationem manus impositionis puto sanctificari: et quod accipiunt, *quamvis non sit corpus Christi*, sanctum est tamen, *et sanctius quam cibi quibus alimur*, quoniam sacramentum est."

This is usually taken to refer to the salt given to the catechumen, of which Augustine says: "Adhuc puer . . . signabar jam signo crucis et condiebar ejus sale" (*Confess.* I. xi. 17), but the phrases italicized are more applicable to something that might be mistaken on the one hand for the eucharistic species, or on the other, for common bread. The term *Eulogiae* is sometimes applied to this blessed bread.

A condensed account of Drews' contentions is contained in Smend, *Kelchspendung u. Kelchversagung in der abendländ. Kirche* (Göttingen, 1898), pp. 88 ff.

[1] See p. 43.

[2] *e.g.* Cyril Alexand. *in Luc* xxii. 19. "εὐχαριστεῖ μὲν τουτέστιν ἐν σχήματι προσευχῆς διαλέγεται τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ κοινωνὸν ὥσπερ αὐτον καὶ συνευδοκητὴν ἀποφαίνων τῆς δοθησομένης ἡμῖν εὐλογίας ζωοποιοῦ κ.τ.λ." *P.G.* lxxii. 908. "Egyptian Liturgy," Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 505. cf. id *in Joan* xii. (*P.G.* lxxiv. 696.)

the surplus of that given at the offertory by the people.[1] This surplus was distributed after the Liturgy, frequently under the name of *ἀντίδωρα*, *i.e.* substitutes for the hallowed gifts. It also has sometimes the signification of a blessing, including the blessing of consecration in the Eucharist;[2] but most commonly the term is separated from a eucharistic context and simply means a gift or token of goodwill.[3]

B. THE FERMENTUM

As the unity of the Church universal was in early times expressed by the custom of the *Eulogiae*, so for a longer period a similar practice symbolized the unity of the local Church or diocese.

From the days of the apostles this local unity was very strongly insisted upon; and the outward expression of it was secured by the joint celebration of the one Eucharist by the bishop together with his presbyters.

It is well known what stress was laid upon this by St. Ignatius of Antioch. "Take care," he tells the Philadelphians, "to keep the one Eucharist. For one is the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one the cup unto union of His Blood. One is the altar, as the bishop is one, together with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow servants."[4]

And again, he writes to the Church at Smyrna, "Let no one perform anything pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop. Let that Eucharist be considered valid which takes place under the bishop, or him to whom he commits it."[5]

[1] *e.g.* John Moschus, *Prat. Spirit.* 25. (*P.G.* lxxxvii. 2869.) Apost. Constit. viii. 31. Augustine, *de remiss. peccat.* II. 42 (26).

[2] *e.g.* by continuation or imitation of the use in 1 Corinthians x. 16. τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν.

[3] For a full list of meanings acquired see Ducange, *Glossarium*, s.v., or *D.C.A.* s.v.

[4] *ad Philadelph.* 4. "Σπουδάσατε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ· ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις τοῖς συνδούλοις μου· ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν πράσσητε κατὰ θεὸν πράσσητε." (Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers* (Texts), p. 124.)

[5] *ad Smyrnaeos*, 8. "μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ." (*op. cit.* p. 129.) cf. *Ephesians* 5, etc.

But, with the development and expansion of the Church, the primitive custom of concelebration ceased to be usual, and therefore other means had to be employed to emphasize in the local ecclesiastical unit the oneness of the Christian offering. Of these the most striking was the use of the *Fermentum*. In order to secure the recognition of this unity a whole Host or a portion of the consecrated Bread was sent by the bishop to the clergy of the district churches.

This custom was established at an early date in Rome, but it is doubtful whether we are to follow the judgement of some writers and see an allusion to it in the Life of St. Zephyrinus (A.D. 203–221), as recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis*.[1]

There are two other passages in the same work in which the *Fermentum* is definitely mentioned. They occur in the lives of two fourth-century Popes, Miltiades (A.D. 311–314) and Siricius (A.D. 384–399).

Of Miltiades it is related that he caused the consecrated offerings to be sent from the bishop's mass to the city churches, and that this was the *Fermentum*.[2] Siricius

[1] "Zepherinus . . . fecit constitutum de ecclesia et patenas vitreas ante sacerdotes in ecclesia et ministros supportantes, donec episcopus missas celebraret, ante se sacerdotes adstantes, sic missae celebrarentur ; excepto quod jus episcopi interest tantum, clerus sustineret omnibus praesentes ; ex ea consecratione de manu episcopi jam coronam consecratam acciperet presbiter tradendam populo." (*Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Duchesne) I. p. 139.)

Duchesne is of opinion that the passage, which is very obscure, is concerned with the attendance of the clergy at the pontifical mass. His interpretation is subjoined.

"Zéphyrin fit (c.à.d. établit l'usage de tenir) des patènes de verre devant les prêtres, à l'église et (de les faire tenir par) des ministres, qui les portent pendant que l'évêque célèbre la messe, les prêtres se tenant debout dévant lui (sacerdotes adstantes—sacerdotibus adstantibus). C'est ainsi qu'on doit célèbrer la messe. Le clergé, sauf le droit de l'évêque (de dispenser ou d'occuper ailleurs) doit assister à toute la cérémonie (omnibus praesentes). La consécration étant ainsi faite, le prêtre reçoit de la main de l'évêque, la couronne consacrée pour la donner au peuple." He remarks that the phrase, "tradendam populo," excludes the supposition that the consecrated Bread was carried away to be used as *Fermentum*. Concelebration of the Pope and the cardinal priests persisted on certain great festivals—Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and St. Peter's Day—until the eighth or ninth century (*Ordo Romanus Primus*, 48).

[2] "Miltiades . . . ab eodem die fecit ut oblationes consecratas per ecclesias ex consecratu episcopi dirigerentur quod declaratur fermentum." (*op. cit.* p. 168.)

ordained that no priest should celebrate at any time in the week unless he had received the *Fermentum* as a sign of the bishop's permission to do so.[1]

As evidence for the persistence of the custom at Rome into the next century there is the letter of Pope Innocent I (A.D. 401–417) to Bishop Decentius of Eugubium. In the course of his counsel, Innocent says that, according to the custom of the Romans, the sending abroad of the *Fermentum* was limited to the churches within the city : there was no need to send out to the country and cemetery churches.[2]

The actual ceremony was very simple. It is described in the eighth or ninth-century supplement to the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, where directions are given for the celebration of the Liturgy at a stational church in the absence of the Pontiff.

"*Sixthly*, when *The Peace of the Lord be with you always* is to be said, the subdeacon-oblationer brings a fragment of the *Fermentum*, which has been hallowed by the Pope, and gives it to the archdeacon ; and he offers it to the bishop, who, making the sign of the cross with it thrice as he says, *The Peace of the Lord be with you always*, drops it into the chalice. Bishops who rule over cities perform all things as the Pope himself."[3]

[1] "Siricius . . . constituit ut nullus presbiter missas celebraret per omnem ebdomadam nisi consecratum episcopi loci designati susciperet declaratum quod nominatur fermentum." *Locus designatus* is the church at which the stational mass is celebrated. (*op. cit.* p. 216.)

[2] "De fermento vero, quod die dominica per titulos mittimus, superflue nos consulere voluistis, cum omnes ecclesiae vestrae intra civitatem sint constitutae. Quarum presbyteri, quia die ipso propter plebem sibi creditam nobiscum convenire non possunt, idcirco fermentum a nobis confectum per acolythos accipiunt, ut se a nostra communione maxima illa die non judicent separatos ; quod per parochias fieri debere non puto, quia non longe portanda sunt sacramenta, nec nos per coemeteria diversa constitutis presbyteris destinamus, et presbyteri eorum conficiendorum jus habent atque licentiam." (*P.L.* xx. 556, 557.) Duchesne (*op. cit.* p. 169) accepts this letter as genuine. Other writers have suspected its authenticity.

[3] *Ordo Romanus Primus*, Append. I. 22. "Quando dici debet : *pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, deportatur a subdiacono oblationario particula fermenti quod ab apostolico consecratum est, et datur archidiacono : ille vero porrigit episcopo. At ille consignando tribus vicibus et dicendo : *pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, mittit in calicem. . . . Episcopi qui civitatibus praesident, ut summus pontifex ita omnia peragunt." (Atchley, *Ordo Roman. Prim.* pp. 146, 148.)

The *Ordo of St. Amand*, which (according to Duchesne)[1] represents a ninth-century recension of the First Order, drawn up somewhere in Gaul, describes the use of the *Fermentum* in similar terms, but uses the word *Sancta*, where the meaning is obviously *Fermentum*. Possibly some confusion has been caused by the fact that the Order still keeps up the semblance of the Pontiff's control of a stational mass, where, as a matter of fact, the conditions are entirely different.[2]

The terms *Sancta* and *Fermentum* are confused again in the ceremonies of Easter Even, set forth in the same document.[3]

The ceremony that at first took place on every day that was liturgically observed came at a later date to be limited to certain solemn occasions. Its restriction seems to be alluded to in the *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, where the use of the *Fermentum* is specially ordered for the Saturday preceding Holy Week.[4]

Mabillon notes an ancient gloss on the *Letter of Innocent to Decentius*, which he found in an MS. in the Library of St. Emmeram at Ratisbon. Here the days on which the *Fermentum* was sent abroad are given as Maundy Thursday, Easter Even, Easter Day, Pentecost, and Christmas Day; and it is further stated that no presbyter of the "baptismal" churches may give the communion on Easter Even before receiving the Host from the Pope's mass.[5]

[1] *Christian Worship*, p. 149.

[2] "Et dum dixerit (episcopus) *pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, tenet subdiaconus de sancta cum corporale ad cornu altaris quod pontifex consecravit, et accipit eam diaconus et tradit eam episcopo aut presbytero. Et exinde facit crucem super calicem, dicendo *pax*," etc. (Duchesne, *op. cit.* (English trans. 1904), p. 464.)

[3] ". . . Ipsa nocte, omnes presbiteri cardinales non ibi stant, sed unusquisque per titulum suum facit missa et habet licentiam sedere in sede et dicere *gloria in excelsis deo*. Et transmittit unusquisque presbiter mansionarium de titulo suo ad ecclesiam salvatoris, et expectant ibi usque dum frangitur sancta, habentes secum corporales. Et venit oblationarius subdiaconus et dat eis de sancta quod pontifex consecravit et recipiunt ea in corporales, et revertitur unusquisque ad titulum suum et tradit sancta presbitero. Et de ipsa facit crucem super calicem et ponit in eo et dicit *dominus vobiscum*." (*op. cit.* pp. 470, 471.)

[4] See for example Gerbert's text in *Monumenta Lit. Alem.* I. p. 426. "Sabbato. Datur fermentum in consistorio Lateranense."

[5] "De fermento quod dicitur mos est Romanis ut de missa quae cantatur in cena domini et in sabbato sancto et in die sancto paschae

The close resemblance between the giving of the *Fermentum* and the use of a Host at ordination is very apparent. In both cases the act symbolizes the unity of the Church, and guarantees as valid and regular the ministrations of the recipient.

C. THE SANCTA

That which was expressed in regard to space by the *Eulogiae* and the *Fermentum*—the oneness and continuity of the eucharistic offering—was symbolized in point of time by the ceremony of the *Sancta*.

A fragment of the Host consecrated at a previous mass, or an entire Host reserved for this purpose, was placed in the chalice at the words, *pax domini sit semper vobiscum*.

As the earliest definite allusion to the ceremony[1] occurs in the sixth-century work of St. German of Paris, we may suppose it to have originated in Gaul, though it was not confined to that country.

The rather elaborate accompaniments of the procession that brought in the *Sancta* from the place of reservation for use in the mass are described by St. German thus:—

"The Lord commanded Moses to make silver trumpets, which the Levites were to sound whenever the sacrifice was offered; and this was to be the signal by which all the people should know the hour at which the oblation was being carried in, so that all might bow down and adore the Lord, while the column of fire or cloud approached which sanctified the sacrifice. And now the Church hymns the Body of Christ as it advances to the altar, yet no longer with trumpets but with spiritual voices singing the glories of Christ in sweet measures."

He tells us that the sacrament was carried into the

et in pentecosten et in natali domini die sancto per totum annum servatur, et ubicumque per stationes si ipse papa ad missam praesens non fuerit de ipsa missa mittitur in calicem cum dixit *pax domini sit semper vobiscum*. Et hoc dicitur fermentum. Tamen sabbato sancto paschae nullus presbyter per ecclesias baptismales neminem communicat antequam mittatur ei de ipsa sancta, quam obtulit dominus papa." (*Iter German. Descript.* p. 65.)

[1] See, however, chap. xiii, s.v. *Capsa*.

church enclosed in a vessel called, from its shape, a tower (*turris*).[1]

It is to this procession of the *Sancta* from the sacrarium that Gregory of Tours refers in his story of an unworthy deacon, and the miracle that rebuked him. This is what he says: "I recall something that I heard of in my youth. It happened on the day of St. Polycarp's martyrdom and in Riom, a town in Auvergne. After the reading of the passion and the other lections . . . the time for offering the sacrifice approached, and a deacon, taking the tower in which the mystery of the Lord's Body was kept, began to carry it to the door (*i.e.* the door that opened from the sacristy into the church). But, on his entering the church to place it on the altar, it slipped from his hands and was borne through the air, and so came to the altar by itself."[2] The deacon had been guilty of a crime that he afterwards confessed.

The story is of interest because it shows the liturgical point, *i.e.* the offertory, at which the *Sancta* were brought into the church from the sacristy, according to the early Gallican use.

At Rome the ceremony took place at a different point, namely, after the introit. The *Ordo Romanus Primus* has the following directions :—

[1] *Expositio brevis Antiquae Liturg. Gall.* De Sono. ("Praecepit dominus Moysi ut faceret tubas argenteas, quas levitae clangerent quando offerebatur hostia, et hoc esse signum per quod intelligeret populus qua hora inferebatur oblatio, et omnes incurvati adorarent dominum, donec veniret columna ignis aut nubes, qui benediceret sacrificium.) Nunc autem procedentem ad altarium corpus Christi non jam tubis irreprachensibilibus sed spiritalibus vocibus praeclara Christi magnalia dulci modilia psallet ecclesia. Corpus vero domini ideo defertur in turribus, quia monumentum domini in similitudinem turris fuit scissum in petra, et intus lectum ubi pausavit corpus dominicum, unde surrexit rex gloriae in triumphum." (*P.L.* lxxii. 92, 93.)

[2] *Miraculor. Lib. I. de Gloria Martyr.* 86. "Nam recolo quod in adolescentia mea gestum audivi. Dies passionis erat Polycarpi martyris magni et in Ricomagensi vico civitatis Arvernae ejus sollemnia celebrabantur. Lecta igitur passione cum reliquis lectionibus, quas canon sacerdotalis invexit, tempus ad sacrificium offerendum advenit, acceptaque turre diaconus, in qua mysterium dominici corporis habebatur, ferre coepit ad ostium; ingressusque templum ut eam altari superponeret, elapsa de manu ejus ferebatur in aera, et sic ad ipsam aram accedens, nunquam eam manus diaconi potuit assequi : quod non alia credimus actum de causa, nisi quia pollutus erat in conscientia." (*P.L.* lxxi. 781.)

"Then two acolytes approach, holding open pyxes containing the *Sancta* ; and the subdeacon who accompanies them takes the *Sancta*, holding his hand on the mouth of the pyx, and shows the *Sancta* to the Pontiff or to the deacon who precedes him. Then the Pontiff or the deacon salutes the *Sancta*, and looks to see whether there be more than is necessary, that he may bid some to be put aside into the aumbry."[1]

The actual use of the *Sancta* comes later, as we have remarked—at the point where the words *pax domini*, etc., are said before the kiss of peace. "When the Pontiff says, *The Peace of the Lord be with you always*, he makes the cross with his hand over the chalice thrice, and drops the *Sancta* into it."[2]

This use of the reserved sacrament disappeared at a date not long after the eighth century, probably through confusion with the fraction and commixture. Thus Amalarius of Metz quotes (from an *ordo* closely akin to the *ordo* ii of Mabillon's enumeration) the phrase, *cum dixerit pax*, etc., *mittit in calicem de sancta*, but is evidently not familiar with the ceremony ; for he says, in the introductory part of his chapter, *de immissione panis in vinum*. "I notice that there is some variety of use in regard to the placing of the bread in the wine. Some first drop a fragment of the holy element (*sancta*) into the chalice, and then say, *The Peace of the Lord* ; while, on the other hand, some delay the act until the *pax* has been made and the *fraction* as well."[3] Here the confusion is obvious.

[1] *Ordo Romanus Primus*, 8. "Et tunc duo acolythi tenentes capsas cum sanctis apertas, et subdiaconus sequens cum ipsis tenens manum suam in ore capsae ostendit sancta pontifici vel diacono qui praecesserit. Tunc inclinato capite pontifex vel diaconus salutat sancta et contemplatur, ut, si fuerit superabundans, praecipiat ut ponatur in conditorio. . . ." (Atchley, *Ord. Rom. Prim.*, p. 128.)

[2] *ibid.* 18. "Cum dixerit : *pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, faciens crucem tribus vicibus manu sua super calicem, mittit sancta in eum. . . ." (Atchley, *op. cit.* p. 138.)

A Carolingian recension (*Ordo Romanus II*) of this order gives the following directions : "Et pertransit pontifex in caput scholae et in gradu superiore, inclinato capite ad altare, primo adorat sancta, et stat semper inclinatus usque ad versum prophetalem"; and later, "Cum dixerit *pax*, etc., mittit in calicem de sancta oblata." (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* ii. pp. 43, 49.)

[3] *De eccl. officiis* III. 31. "Immissionem panis in vinum cerno apud quosdam varie actitari, ita ut aliqui primo mittant de sancta in calicem et

There is no trace of the actual ceremony of the *Sancta* in the ninth-century *Order of St. Amand.* It had gone out of use; and, though the term "*Sancta*" is retained, it is clearly used as meaning the *Fermentum*.[1]

D. THE COMMUNION OF THE PRESANCTIFIED

It lies beyond the scope of this work to give more than a bare outline of the history of the particular use of the reserved sacrament that ultimately developed into the so-called Liturgy and mass of the Presanctified. All that is here attempted is to draw attention to the conditions under which it probably arose, and to notice some of the more important modifications in the development of the rite, after it had definitely acquired a kind of quasi-liturgical character. On account of the light which it throws upon the subject of official reservation in general, the former of these aims is of considerable importance to our inquiry.

I. The origin of the communion of the Presanctified is to be sought in the conjunction of two circumstances that were operative to a greater or less extent throughout the Church during a period extending from the third century to the end of the fifth. One of these was the habit of frequent communion; the other, the restriction of the celebration of the Liturgy to certain days of the week.

In regard to both of these particulars there was considerable variety of local custom, but frequent and even daily communion during the greater part of this period is attested by a number of writers from all parts of Christendom.[2] As to the other point, it is necessary to remark that a primitive instinct which regarded seasons and days of a penitential character as unsuitable for the celebration of the Eucharist was specially prominent in the

postea dicant, *pax domini*; e contra aliqui reservent immissionem usque dum pax celebrata est et fractio panis." (*P.L.* cv. 1151, 1152.)

[1] cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 461.

[2] Frequent or daily Communion—at Rome, Augustine (Ep. 54), Jerome (Ep. 48, Ep. 71); in Spain, Jerome (Ep. 71); in Africa, Cyprian (De orat. dom. 18); Augustine (De sermone domini, lib. II, c. 7, n. 25, Serm. 227, etc.); at Alexandria, Clement (Quis dives salvetur, 23), Origen (Hom. x in Genes.); in Gaul, Hilary of Poitiers (Frag. vii. *P.L.* x. 725). See *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de la Liturgie*, art. "communion quotidienne."

East, and left a permanent impression on the usage of the Oriental Churches.[1]

An expression of this point of view is to be seen in a decree of the fourth-century Council of Laodicea, restricting the Liturgy in Lent to the Sabbath and the Lord's Day.[2]

It is more difficult to determine the limitation of liturgical observance in the West. There are early writers who speak of a daily offering of the sacrifice, and these are either to be understood as referring to special circumstances or to be making statements concerning local custom, that admit, in all probability, of certain exceptions.[3]

St. Augustine, who knows of daily celebration, and speaks of daily communion as the custom of the African Church, is witness in another place for diversity of custom elsewhere.[4] Again, Wednesday and Friday, the station-days, were everywhere observed, but the services on these days did not in all places include the celebration of the Eucharist. At Rome and Alexandria the station-days were for a long time (probably until the fifth century or later) non-liturgical, and this was the case during Lent in the

[1] Probably because in the East the Liturgy is above all, the Eucharist, "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving"; the propitiatory aspect has been more dominant in the West. cf. remarks on this point by Allatius and Balsamon. The present Lenten custom of the East (based upon a canon of Council "in Trullo") is given below, p. 84.

[2] *Can.* 49. "ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ καὶ κυριακῇ μόνον." (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, I. 2. p. 1021.) cf. *Can.* 6, *op. cit.* p. 1008.

[3] Frequent or daily celebration is implied in many references to frequent communion, though not necessarily in all. In St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 58, *ad Thibaritanos*, § 1), "milites Christi . . . cotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere," the mention of the chalice precludes reference to private habit. But this may be merely a figurative reference to St. Matt. xx. 22. In *De Dom. Oratione*, § 18, "hunc autem panem dari nobis cottidie postulamus," it is not clear whether the reception is public or private.

St. Augustine (*Ep.* 98, § 9). "Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes paschae solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari?" See index to *Opera*, Benedictine ed.

Concil. Tolet. i. *Can.* 5. All clerks must attend the daily sacrifice (sacrificium quotidianum). (Hard. I. 990.) Chrysostom (*Hom. in Ephes.* iii) complains that the daily sacrifice is neglected.

[4] *Ep.* 54: "alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt; alibi nullus dies praetermittitur quo non offeratur, alibi sabbato tantum et dominico, alibi tantum dominico."

East, where the Liturgy was normally celebrated on these days at other seasons of the year. Saturday—in the East a liturgical day—was from an early date a fast in the West, and on this day too the Eucharist was not celebrated at Rome and Alexandria.

Little is known of the early observances of Holy Week in the Latin Church (apart from the fasts and the ceremonies connected with baptism). We have only a few scattered allusions on which to build.[1] Pope Innocent I, if he is really the author of the letter to Decentius, makes the definite statement, however, that the Eucharist is not to be offered on Good Friday or Easter Even, because on those days the apostles were in sorrow and in fear.[2]

To sum up, then: At a time when synaxes that did not include the Liturgy were not uncommon, and indeed were in some places a regular part of the weekly and seasonal observances, and when, again, the habit of private reservation had begun to disappear, some means was likely to be found by which the custom of frequent communion might be maintained. It seems a safe conclusion to draw, that the "Communion of the Presanctified" must have been usual in places where the desire for frequent reception of the sacrament found itself faced with restricted liturgical observance. We should therefore expect to find no definite date nor special place of origin for a custom that would be likely, from the circumstances of the case, to arise sporadically in response to a practical need.

How necessary it would be at some seasons to make provision for communion apart from the performance of the Liturgy is apparent when we consider the vast numbers that were baptized and immediately communicated in the city churches on Easter Even. The custom at Constantinople (in the fourth and fifth centuries) was to reserve from the *Coena Domini* a sufficient quantity of the sacrament in both kinds to serve for the communion of the newly-

[1] *e.g.* the omission of the kiss of peace in Holy Week (Tert. *de Orat.* 8).

[2] *Epist. ad Decent.* "Nam utique constat apostolos biduo isto et in moerore fuisse, et propter metum Judaeorum se occuluisse. Quod utique non dubium est in tantum eos jejunasse biduo memorato ut traditio ecclesiae habeat isto biduo sacramenta penitus non celebrari." (*P.L.* xx. 555.)

baptized on the Easter Vigil;[1] and it is unlikely that this was a local peculiarity, or that reservation was entirely confined to this season, and unknown at any other time.[2]

To these considerations and the conclusions to which they lead we shall return when we discuss official reservation for the communion of the sick. We must now turn to the development of the "*Liturgy*," or "*Mass*," of the Presanctified, with the preliminary remarks that neither term is rightly applied to a service in which no consecration occurs, and that such a description is particularly inapplicable to the form ultimately assumed by the Presanctified in the Latin Church.

For some reason or other the compilation of the "Liturgy of the Presanctified" has been attributed by Eastern theologians to St. Gregory the Great. There is, however, no unanimity on this point, and the fact that a Western origin is implied in this ascription is of no great value in determining the area wherein the rite first appeared as a developed form.[3]

Although the earliest unambiguous references to the rite are to be found both in East and West in the seventh century, the claim to priority seems to be more justly assigned to the East, for the document containing the

[1] Chrysostom, *Epist. ad Innocent. Papam.* l. 3. (*Opera*, edit. Gaume, iii. 618.)

[2] The later developments of extra-liturgical communion in public, from the sacrament reserved in church, such as is still practised in churches both of the Latin and Greek obedience, seem hardly to call for notice here. They merely constitute a perpetuation or an unintentional reversion to early custom on grounds of practical necessity or convenience. For an early reference, cf. Humbert, *Adv. calumn. Graecor.* 33. (*P.L.* cxliii. 952.) He states that communion was administered to pilgrims at Jerusalem in the sole species of Bread, which had been consecrated the previous day.

[3] "It is generally attributed in MSS. and editions to St. Gregory Dialogus, *i.e.* St. Gregory the Great of Rome; but otherwise to St. Epiphanius (Vat. *Graec.* 1213, Bodl. *Cromw.* 11.) or to St. Germanus of Constantinople (Corsiniana 41. E 29, 41. E 31, Bodl. *Auct.* E 5. 13.), and a passage common to Theodore of Andida, *Comment. liturg.* 32, and Sophronius, *Comment. liturg.* I, states that some attribute it to St. James, others to St. Peter, and others to other authors; and in Sinai *Graec.* 1040 it is apparently assigned to St. Basil. See Mai, *Nov. patrum biblioth.* V. (4), pp. 97–99." (Brightman, *loc. cit.*) See Scudamore, *N.E.* p. 898, note 3. *ad loc.*

earliest Western reference bears marks of an Eastern origin.[1]

Reference to "Liturgy of the Presanctified" in the East occurs first in the *Chronicon Paschale* (A.D. 645);[2] and toward the end of the same century the Council in Trullo (A.D. 692) published a canon wherein it was decreed that on all days of Lent except the Sabbath and the Lord's Day and the Feast of the Annunciation, the Liturgy of the Presanctified was to be performed. That is to say, the celebration of the Eucharist was limited during this season to the days specifically named.[3] This rule has ever since continued in force among the Orthodox Churches of the East, for with them the canons of this council are reckoned as supplementary to the decrees of the Sixth General Council (Constantinople iii), and so have oecumenical force.

As to the form of service in which the communion was administered on non-liturgical days at that date, it was doubtless very similar in all essentials to that which is to be found in the Byzantine rite of the ninth century,[4] from which the form in current use also has made very little departure. With the omission of the consecration and associated matter the important features of the Liturgy are retained. The prothesis, the "mass of the catechumens," with the lections and other constituents, and the dismissals form, as usual, the preliminaries. In the "mass of the faithful," at the greater entrance, the conjointly reserved elements are produced, instead of the bread and wine, intended for consecration, as in the Liturgy proper. A number of prayers, including the Lord's Prayer, the inclination, the elevation, consignation, and commixture

[1] See below, p. 85.

[2] Brightman, *Liturgies*, p. xciii. (*P.G.* xcii. 989.)

[3] *Can.* 52. "Ἐν πάσαις τῆς ἁγίας τεσσαρακοστῆς ἡμέραις . . . παρεκτὸς σαββάτου καὶ κυριακῆς καὶ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ εὐαγγελίσμου ἡμέρας γινέσθω ἡ τῶν προηγιασμένων ἱερὰ λειτουργία."

The "Liturgy of the Presanctified" is used only during Lent, on Wednesdays and Fridays; in the fifth week of Lent, on Thursday; and on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Easter. (Hapgood, *Service Book*, p. 600.)

[4] Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 586. It is described as being "constructed from the ordinary liturgy by the omission of all between the offertory and the Lord's Prayer, the offertory prayer becoming the proem of the Lord's Prayer."

follow, and then the communion.[1] In other words we have the structure of the Liturgy with the central action removed and the communion of the Presanctified inserted at the liturgical point where the communion normally occurs.[2]

In the West the *Regula Magistri* directs that on Maundy Thursday "the sacraments of the altar are to be consecrated (*finiantur*) in the greater glass paten; so that when the Jews shall come seeking Christ for His passion on the sixth day, He may be hidden that very day in our minds, and on the Sabbath appear to us through His Resurrection in a new sacrament."[3] Those who take food on Good Friday must go without communion.

The exact meaning of some details of this statement is not altogether clear, but it seems that the use of the Presanctified on Good Friday is implied. It is noteworthy that the document bears marks of being translated from the Greek, especially the use of the form *finiantur*, which is the equivalent of the common use of ἐκτελεῖσθαι for consecration.[4] The Latin version was made some time in the seventh century, by an unknown writer, for the regulation of life and worship in a monastery.

A fairly full description is given in a Roman *ordo* adapted to the use of a Benedictine house, which probably dates from the eighth century.[5] It follows the same order that is prescribed in the Gelasian Sacramentary. Since this important document preserving the use of the Gallican

[1] Brightman, *op. cit.* pp. 345 ff. A scheme of the Liturgy of the Presanctified in the twelfth century according to the Syrian (Greek) Rite is given on pp. 494 ff. In the Egyptian group the Presanctified of the apostle Mark is mentioned in a rubric of the (Greek) Egyptian Liturgy of St. Basil. (Brightman, *op. cit.* p. lxvi.)

[2] In the Orthodox Russian Church vespers and a special form of the offices for the third, sixth, and ninth hours precede the service of the "Presanctified." (Hapgood, *op. cit.* p. 601.)

[3] *Auctoris incerti regula.* 53: "sacramenta vero altaris in patena majore vitrea finiantur; ut cum sexta feria Judaei ad passionem Christum quaesierint, sit ipso die mentibus nostris inclusus, ut sabbato nobis per resurrectionem in novo sacramento appareat. Jam qui sexta feria refecturi sunt, sine communione reficiant; ut agnoscatur jam quis sexta feria injuste refici sine Christo." (*P.L.* lxxxviii. 1016.)

[4] Scudamore, *N.E.*, p. 899.

[5] *Antiquus Ordo Romanus ad usum Monast.* in *Thesaur. Nov. Anecdot.* v. 108. (*P.L.* lxvi. 997.)

Church about A.D. 800 probably represents a much earlier Roman tradition, the Liturgy of the Presanctified as it occurs in the sacramentary deserves a fuller notice.

On Good Friday, at the ninth hour, all go to church, and the holy cross is placed upon the altar. A silent procession of the clergy takes place from the sacristy to the altar. After the first prayer has been said a lection is read, with its respond, and another prayer. Another lection and respond lead up to the reading of the passion, as it is given in the Gospel according to St. John. The long series of solemn prayers succeeds, and at their conclusion two deacons enter the sacristy, and come forth bearing the sacrament, "*the Body and Blood of the Lord which remain over from the preceding day*" (*i.e.* Maundy Thursday). It is placed upon the altar, and then the priest approaches, salutes the cross, and begins the prayer, *praeceptis salutaribus moniti*, says the *pater noster*, and concludes with the usual *libera nos domine*. Then all present salute the cross, and a general communion follows.[1]

This type of service is also to be found in the *ordines*

[1] "Incipit ordo de feria vi, passione domini. Hora nona procedunt omnes ad ecclesiam ; et ponitur sancta crux super altare. Et egreditur sacerdos de sacrario cum sacris ordinibus, cum silentio, nihil canentes, et veniunt ante altare postulans sacerdos pro se orare, et dicit : *oremus*. Et annuntiat diaconus : *flectamus genua*. Et post paululum dicit : *levate*. Et dat orationem, *deus a quo et Judas*," etc. "Ista oratione expleta vadis retro altare et legitur lectio. Deinde sequitur responsorium. Iterum dicit sacerdos : *oremus*. Et annuntiat diaconus ut supra, et sequitur alia oratio, *deus, qui peccati veteris haereditariam mortem*," etc. "Item sequitur lectio et responsorium. Inde vero legitur passio domini. Ipsa expleta, incipit sacerdos orationes solemnes, quae sequuntur. . . ."

"Istas orationes supra scriptas expletas, ingrediuntur diaconi in sacrario. Procedunt cum corpore et sanguinis domini quod ante die remansit : et ponunt super altare. Et venit sacerdos ante altare, adorans crucem domini et osculans. Et dicit *oremus*. Et sequitur *praeceptis salutaribus moniti*, et oratio dominica. Inde *libera nos domine quaesumus*. Haec omnia expleta, adorant omnes sanctam crucem et communicant." H. A. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 74–77. The Merovingian spelling and grammar are left uncorrected. The Gelasian rubric was copied into many later rituals, *e.g.* those of Noyons, Rheims, and Gellone (Mart., *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* iv. 23, § 27). Before the introduction of the Gelasian Sacramentary it would seem that the Gallican Church was content with a primitive non-liturgical synaxis on Good Friday, without any regular rite for communion on that day. Provision for such a service, without the Presanctified, is found in sacramentaries of Gallican type. No "Mass of the Presanctified" was known to the contemporary Church in Spain.

of the eighth and ninth centuries that provide for the communion of the Presanctified in the churches at Rome, or in those parts of Christendom that took as their models the usages of the pontifical see.[1] It has retained this form in the West ever since. The setting in which the communion of the Presanctified has been preserved is easily separable from the primitive rite which it enshrines. For the structure of the Latin "*Missa Presanctificatorum*," in spite of some modifications in points of detail, represents a typical non-liturgical synaxis (complicated on Good Friday by the added ceremony of the adoration of the cross),[2] in which communion is administered from the sacrament reserved for this purpose since Maundy Thursday. This short sketch of the two forms assumed by the framework enclosing the rite in different parts of the Church is enough to show that structurally they have developed independently of each other. Their only real point of contact is their common origin in the attempt to provide for public communion on days when the Eucharist was not consecrated. Removed from the frame that contains it, the administration of the Presanctified both in East and West is simply the communion isolated from the Liturgy.

We have next to notice that while the communion of the Presanctified is characteristic, in the East, of many of the non-liturgical days of Lent, it is confined in the West to Good Friday alone, for by the time that the rite had reached its permanent form, this day alone of all the year remained non-liturgical.[3]

Two of the more important modifications, affecting more particularly the Latin rite, that appear subsequently to the ninth century now claim our attention. These are, first, the disappearance of the species of Wine from the communion ; and, secondly, the restriction of communion to the celebrant.

[1] They may be seen in the supplements affixed to the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, and in other *Ordines* in Mabillon's collection (*Mus. Ital.* II).

[2] The Adoration of the Cross was known in the East as early as the fourth century, but it is not stated at what date it was introduced into the West before the seventh century.

[3] An exception to the general Western Rule occurs in the Milanese custom of keeping every Friday in Lent as a *dies aliturgica*. (Magistretti, *Cenni sul Rito Ambr.* (Milan, 1895), p. 28. Beroldus, *Ordo*, ed. Magistretti, pp. 90, 205.)

At first both species of the sacrament were employed in the communion of the Presanctified, as was the case at Constantinople when provision was made for the communion of the newly-baptized on Easter Even.

And when the Presanctified appears in the West, we find explicit mention of the two elements, *e.g.* in the eighth-century Benedictine order to which reference was made on a preceding page. "The deacon receives the Body and Blood of the Lord which was left the day before (the *Coena Domini*), and was then consecrated, and places (them) on the altar; and all communicate of the Body and Blood of the Lord in silence without any singing."[1] It is just possible that the use of singular forms of the verb (*remansit et consecratum fuerit*) may point to reservation in a conjoint manner, but this cannot be pressed.

The sacrament is referred to in similar terms by the compiler of the *Gelasian Sacramentary*,[2] and Mabillon draws attention to the mention of both species in the monastic *Sacramentary of Gellone*, but explains the phrase to mean the *Corpus Domini* alone.[3]

Some time in the ninth century a change was made in the ministration of the communion on Good Friday. For in the description of the Holy Week services, in the additions to the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, unconsecrated wine is substituted for the consecrated species, and the sacrament is reserved only in the form of Bread.

Moreover, priests and not deacons[4] bring the sacrament forth from the place in which it was kept. "Two of the principal presbyters go to the sacrarium or wherever the Body of the Lord which remained from the previous day was kept, and place it upon a paten. Let a subdeacon hold

[1] *Ant. Ordo Rom. ad usum Monast.*: "Et accipit diaconus corpus et sanguinem domini quod ante die coena domini remansit et consecratum fuit, et ponit super altare." (*Thesaur. Nov. Anecdot.* v. 108.)

[2] "Ingrediuntur diaconi in sacrario. Procedunt cum corpore et sanguinis (*sic*) domini quod ante die remansit." (Wilson, *loc. cit.*)

[3] *Mus. Ital.* II. p. lxxi: "Corpus Christi quod corpus et sanguis domini appellatur."

[4] cf. Mabillon, *op. cit. ibid.*: ". . . Augustinus Patricius in suo ceremoniali, 'quod ante Johannem xxii diaconus portabat ante altare sacramentum, quod etiam communis rubrica habet. Post illa tempora,' inquit, 'pontifex portat, et melius.'"

before them a chalice filled with unconsecrated wine, and another subdeacon the paten with the Lord's Body." Chalice and paten are then taken by the two presbyters and placed on the stripped altar. After the salutation of the cross by the people, the pontiff leaves his place and stands before the holy Table while he says the usual prayers. "Then as the people respond *Amen*, he takes a portion of the holy element and drops it into the chalice, without saying anything. Every one communicates in silence, and the service concludes."[1]

Communion was apparently still made not only by partaking of the consecrated Bread, but also of the wine which was held to be hallowed by the admixture described. But not long after this date the use even of unconsecrated wine disappeared by degrees, and various explanations were offered for its omission from the rite.[2]

The Easterns have long made use of the reserved intincted species for communion at this service, and the *Euchologion* gives detailed directions for the preparation of

[1] "Presbyteri vero duo priores . . . intrant sacrarium, vel ubi positum fuerat corpus domini, quod pridie remansit, ponentes eum in patena; et subdiaconus teneat ante ipsos calicem cum vino non consecrato, et alter subdiaconus patenam cum corpore domini: quibus tenentibus accipit unus presbyter patenam et alter calicem, et deferunt super altare nudatum. . . . Cum dixerint, *Amen*, sumit de sancta [pontifex] et ponit in calicem nihil dicens: et communicant omnes cum silentio et expleta sunt universa." (*Mus. Ital.* II. pp. 23, 35.)

[2] There is evidence that in some places in the ninth century the hallowing of the wine in this manner was regarded as a breach of the rule that no consecration should ever take place on Good Friday. "Qui juxta ordinem libelli per commixtionem panis et vini consecrat vinum, non observat traditionem ecclesiae, de qua dicit Innocentius, isto biduo sacramenta penitus non celebrari. Percussus est pastor, oves gregis dissipatae sunt. Pastores, qui videntur esse in ecclesia, declinatione sui officii demonstrant statum illius temporis, qui tunc agebatur apud discipulos Christi. Dominus enim dixit pridie, non bibam de hoc genimine vitis, donec bibam illud vobiscum novum," etc. (Amalarius, *De divinis officiis*, I. 15. in Hittorp. 340.) This follows immediately the statement that Amalarius records the archdeacon of Rome to have made: "In ea statione ubi apostolicus salutat crucem, nemo ibi communicat." It is not certain, therefore, whether Amalarius is stating his own opinions, or whether the substance of these further remarks about the impropriety of consecrating by admixture formed part of the archdeacon's reply.

Amalarius himself elsewhere speaks only of the *corpus domini* as reserved for use on Good Friday.

the sacred elements.[1] But some variety of custom once prevailed. In the twelfth century at Constantinople, the consecrated Bread alone was employed in the Presanctified.[2] This exceptional usage may have been due to the local influence of Latin custom, but in the eleventh century the Bread alone was reserved at Jerusalem for the daily communion of pilgrims.[3]

A general communion is expected at the Presanctified by the Easterns, but in the Western Church communion at this service grew less and less usual until at last it became confined to the celebrant.

The early Western orders, monastic and secular, provide for a general communion. For example the *Regula Magistri*, a monastic document, forbids only those who are not fasting to receive;[4] and the Benedictine recension of a Roman *ordo*, to which we referred on a preceding page, speaks of all the brethren communicating. This was the custom in religious houses for some considerable time.[5] We find provision made for general communion in convents and monasteries as late as or later than the twelfth century.[6]

The laity are supposed to communicate according to Mabillon's text of the *Ordo Romanus Primus*. "Communicant omnes cum silentio;"[7] but this direction was copied in later ritual injunctions after it had ceased to be

[1] Except that the consecrated Bread is not dried after intinction, the preparation of the species for use in the Presanctified is similar to the preparation of the Eucharist to be reserved for the sick.

[2] Thus Michael the Patriarch, 1167: "Not a drop of the Divine Blood is poured upon them [*i.e.* the hosts] thus reserved." (Scudamore, *N.E.* p. 899. Allatius, *De Missa Praesanct.* § xvii. 1586.)

[3] Humbert, *Adv. Calumn. Graecor.* 33. (*P.L.* cxliii. 952.)

[4] "Jam qui sexta feria refecturi sunt sine communione reficiant; ut agnoscatur jam quis sexta feria injuste refici sine Christo." (*P.L.* lxxxviii. 1016.) The sense of this passage is not altogether clear, but it certainly admits the inference in the text.

[5] *Thesaur. Nov. Anecdot.* v. 108. "adorant omnes sanctam crucem et communicant."

[6] Sicardus of Cremona († 1215), *Mitrale* vi. 13. "Cum igitur hac die (Good Friday) non sit corpus domini conficiendum, ad hanc diem est causa triplici reservandum: prima est propter infirmos, ne aliquis decedat sine viatico; *secunda est propter religiosos, qui his tribus diebus communicant*; tertia est propter officium adimplendum." (*P.L.* ccxiii. 320.)

[7] *Mus. Ital.* II. pp. 23, 24.

observed in practice. It reappears, for instance, in the mixed *ordo* printed in Hittorp.[1]

The *Ordo of St. Amand*, which represents a Gallican recension of a Roman *ordo*, and dates from somewhere about A.D. 800, provides for communion at the titular churches. For it retains many traces of its Roman origin, and maintains the semblance of the arrangements that were customary in the pontifical see. The clergy are supposed to meet, as it were, at the Lateran for the lections and solemn prayers, and afterwards return to their own churches, where at the ninth hour the services are repeated, and, after the adoration of the cross, a general communion follows.[2]

References to communion on Good Friday are found in the fragment of an *Ordo Romanus* contained in the Einsiedeln MS. printed by Duchesne from de Rossi. After a description of the procession to the Church of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, the pontiff is directed to return to the Lateran. But it is stated that neither he nor the deacons who accompany him communicate, though, if any one wishes to do so, the Eucharist reserved in pyxes from the previous day is employed for the purpose. Or, in case any one does not desire to communicate at the Lateran, he may receive the sacrament at another church.[3]

[1] *De divinis officiis*, 75. in *Bibliotheca Patrum* x.

[2] "Ipsa autem die, hora V, procedit ad ecclesiam omnis clerus et ingreditur archidiaconus cum aliis diaconibus in sacrario et induunt se planetas fuscas, et egrediuntur de sacrario et duo cereostata ante ipsum cum cereis accensis, et veniunt ante altare. Osculantur altare et vadunt ad sedem pontificis secundum consuetudinem. Deinde annui archidiaconus subdiacono et legatur leccio prima. Sequitur responsorium *domini audivi*; deinde alia leccio, et sequitur tractus *qui habitat*. Deinde legitur passio domini secundum Johannem. Hoc expleto psallit sacerdos de parte sinistra presbiterii in partem dextram altaris infra thronum et dicit orationes sollempnes. Deinde revertuntur presbiteri per titula sua et hora nona tam de lectionibus quam responsoriis vel evangelium seu et oraciones sollemnes faciunt similiter, et adorant sanctam crucem et communicantur omnes." (Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 468.)

[3] The rite at *Jerusalem* contains some peculiarities. See Duchesne, *op. cit.* pp. 482, 483. "Et procedent iterum ad Lateranis psallendo *beati immaculati*. Attamen apostolicus ibi non communicat nec diaconi; qui vero communicare voluerit, communicat de capsis de sacrificio quod V. feria servatum est. Et qui noluerit ibi communicare vadit per alias ecclesias Romae seu per titulos et communicat." (*loc. cit.*)

Amalarius, early in the ninth century, learnt from the local ecclesiastics that no one communicated in Rome at the station where the pontiff saluted the cross;[1] but he observes elsewhere that he himself was familiar with the custom of communicating on these occasions.[2]

Others than the celebrant appear to have communicated in the time of Rabanus Maurus (ninth century)[3] but general communion at the Liturgy of the Presanctified gradually died out (except in religious houses) during the ninth and tenth centuries, although it was not until 1622 that a final decision was given on the subject.[4] Then the Congregation of Rites decreed that the Eucharist is not to be administered on Good Friday, except to the sick. This

[1] *De eccles. officiis*, i. 15. "... interrogavi Romanum archidiaconum et ille respondit: In ea statione ubi apostolicus salutat crucem, nemo ibi communicat." (Hittorp, *op. cit.* 340.)

[2] *De eccles. officiis*, i. 12. "Panis coelestis, id est, corpus domini reservatur a feria quinta usque in parasceven. . . . In parasceve non conficitur corpus domini. Necesse est ut hi, quibus est voluntas communicandi, habeant sacrificium ex priori die." (Hittorp, *op. cit.* 330.)

On this passage, pseudo-Alcuin (eleventh century) comments thus: "De eodem vero die (Maundy Thursday) legitur in ordinibus quod reservandum fit de corpore domini ad communicandum in crastinum . . . quia in parasceve non conficitur corpus domini, necesse est ut hi quibus est voluntas communicandi, habeant sacrificium ex priore die, quod tamen Romani non faciunt." (*De divin. officiis*, Hittorp, 249.)

De eccles. officiis, iv. 20. "Simile est et illud quod Innocentius papa scripsit, non missam celebrari in parasceve et in sabbato sancto: tamen celebratur missa, quae celebrabatur ab apostolis, scilicet per solam orationem dominicam. Si hoc voluit monstrare verbis suis ubi dicit, sacramenta penitus non celebrari, ut nullo modo celebrarentur, nemo id servat apud nos. Sed ut populus qui reficiendus erat ipso die haberet in fundamentum corpus dominicum, et nihilominus reducatur nobis ad memoriam missa apostolorum, celebratur eadem: quod non est necesse fieri in sabbato sancto, quia expectant omnes jejuni usque ad noctem, quando missa celebratur resurrectionis domini." (Hittorp, 470.)

[3] *De Instit. Cleric.* II. 37. "Ipsa die a pontifice et a clero et ab omni populo species sanctae crucis salutatur: quia passio redemptoris a fidelibus in hora redemptionis suae digna laude veneratur. In hac die sacramenta penitus non celebrantur; sed eucharistiam in coena domini consecratam, peracto officio lectionum et orationum, et sanctae crucis salutatione, resumunt." (Hittorp, 605.)

[4] Provision for general communion on Good Friday is made in some of the later *ordines* in Martène's collections, *e.g.* St. Germain des Près, Besançon, Angers, all of the twelfth century. A Strasburg missal of the fourteenth century has "communicet ipse (presbyter) et alii qui voluerint."

was then stated to be the universal custom of the Church.[1]

E. CONSUMPTION OF THE REMAINS AFTER THE LITURGY

Some brief notice must be taken of a number of customs that aim at securing the consumption of what is left of the consecrated elements at the conclusion of the Liturgy. It is evident that the existence of such customs must be recognized and considered before we pass on to speak of the official reservation of the sacrament for the general use of the sick.

Among the Syrian Christians who follow the Persian Rite the celebrant's communion is delayed until the end of the Liturgy, when he communicates by consuming that which remains of the sacrament in paten and chalice. The priest's prayers appended to the Liturgy of the Nestorian Church, which are full of allusions to the act of communion, are said at this point.[2]

This can hardly represent the survival of any early usage, since it involves an unnatural and unparalleled separation of the priest's communion from that of the people at a service where a general communion is contemplated. It is rather a practice peculiar to this part of Christendom.

In the pseudo-Clementine *Second Letter to James, the Lord's Brother*, any superfluity of the sacrament beyond that which is needful for communion is regarded as undesirable; and that which happens to remain is to be consumed by the clergy immediately afterwards, or at least in the course of the day. Elaborate directions as to this duty are given in a paragraph that begins thus:—

"So much of the sacrifice ought to be offered on the

[1] Cavalieri, *Commentaria* (1778), tom. iv, c. iv, decr. iii, p. 33. "In feria sexta parasceves non est ministranda eucharistia, nisi infirmis."

[2] Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. 304, 305. The prayers are placed under the heading, *when they order the mysteries*, and conclude with the "*Seal*"—"For that Thou hast accounted us worthy, O my Lord, to delight in Thy Body and Thy Holy Blood, account us now worthy to delight in Thy kingdom which passeth not away nor is destroyed, with all Thy saints now and ever and world without end. Amen."

altar as is sufficient for the people. If any remain, it shall not be kept till the morrow, but it is the duty of the clergy to see that it be consumed with reverence and fear."[1]

Very similar are the directions of the Sahidic *Ecclesiastical Canons*: "Whatsoever remains over let the presbyters and the deacons gather up, taking careful heed lest there be much over, that so there be not exceeding great judgement upon them like the sons of Aaron and the sons of Eli, whom the Holy Ghost smote because they refrained not from setting at naught the Lord's sacrifice: how much more them that shall think scorn of the Body and Blood of the Lord, deeming that it is only bodily food that they receive and not spiritual."[2]

It might be contended that non-reservation of the Eucharist is intended by the rubric of the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, where it is ordered that when all have communicated, the deacons are to carry the remains into the sacristy.[3] But as nothing is said as to what must be done with the sacrament, it is uncertain whether it is intended that the Eucharist is there to be consumed, or reserved, for the sacristy or *pastophorium* was the place where the sacrament was often kept.[4] A similar direction is to be found in the *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom*, as at present

[1] *Epistola II. ad Jacobum fratrem domini.* "Tribus enim gradibus commissa sunt sacramenta divinorum secretorum, id est presbytero, diacono et ministro, qui cum timore et tremore clericorum reliquias fragmentorum corporis dominici custodire debent, ne qua putredo in sacrario inveniatur ne cum negligenter agitur portioni corporis domini gravis inferatur injuria. . . . Certe tanta in altario holocausta offerantur quanta populo sufficere debeant. Quod si remanserint, in crastinum non reserventur, sed cum timore et tremore clericorum diligentia consumantur. Qui autem residua corporis domini, quae in sacrario relicta sunt, consumunt, non statim ad communes accipiendos cibos conveniant; ne putent sanctae portioni commisceri cibum, qui per aqualiculos digestus in secessum funditur. Si ergo mane dominica portio editur usque ad sextam jejunent ministri qui eam consumpserunt. Et si tertia vel quarta hora acceperint, jejunent usque ad vesperam. Sic secreta sanctificatione aeterna custodienda sunt sacramenta." (*P.L.* i. 483–85.) This document, a forgery of seventh-century date, is included by pseudo-Isidore in the "*Decreta.*"

[2] Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 463.

[3] "*καὶ ὅταν πάντες μεταλάβωσι καὶ πᾶσαι, λαβόντες οἱ διάκονοι τὰ περισσεύσαντα εἰσφερέτωσαν εἰς τὰ παστοφόρια.*" (Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 25.)

[4] See chap. xiii.

used in the Greek Orthodox Church, where it cannot be held to imply the exclusion of reservation.[1]

The Sixteenth Council of Toledo (A.D. 693) published a canon dealing with the bread to be used in the mass, and the clergy were admonished to provide specially-prepared obleys of proper material, whole and wheaten, and of moderate size.[2] The reason for this last requirement was that if there were no occasion to reserve, whatever remained might be consumed without inconvenience. Probably the celebrant or some other clerk would receive that which was left over, or (as in our own rite) it may have been given sometimes to lay-communicants. This, however, is doubtful: in some places such a practice was thought unseemly.

In a series of canons of uncertain date that have been placed by some authorities in the seventh century, but are probably of later date, the clergy are forbidden to perpetuate the custom of giving the contents of the chalice, after mass is done, to laymen and women. The Wine only is definitely mentioned; the other element may be alluded to in the cautionary remark, "who know not how to discern the Lord's Body"; but this is probably the assertion of a general principle, for there follow immediately the words, "that is, to discern between spiritual and carnal food."[3]

[1] "*ὁ δὲ διάκονος εἰσελθὼν καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τοῦ βορείου μέρους συστέλλει τὰ ἅγια μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης ἀσφαλείας ὥστε μηδέν τι τῶν ἄγαν λεπτοτάτων ἐκπεσεῖν ἢ καταλειφθῆναι καὶ ἀπονίπτεται τὰς χεῖρας ἐν τῷ συνήθει τόπῳ.*" (Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 398.)

The text printed in Goar (p. 86) differs considerably from this. "*μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν, εἰ οὐκ ἔστιν διάκονος, εἰσέρχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὴν πρόθεσιν καὶ μεταλαμβάνει τὸ ὑποληφθὲν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ προσεχῶς καὶ εὐλάβως, καὶ ἀποπλύνει τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον τρίς, καὶ ὁρᾷ μὴ μείνῃ τὸ λεγόμενον μαργαρίτης. . . . καὶ συστέλλει τὰ ἅγια, τὸ ποτήριον τὸν δίσκον μετά τοῦ καλύμματος κατὰ τὸ ἔθος. Εἰ δέ ἐστιν διάκονος ὁ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ.*"

It is noteworthy that the priest is supposed to dispense with the deacon's ministrations in the ceremony.

[2] *Can.* 6. ". . . non aliter panis in altari domini sacerdotali benedictione sanctificandus proponatur nisi integer et nitidus qui ex studio fuerit praeparatus: necque grande aliquid, sed modica tantum oblata secundum quod ecclesiastica consuetudo retentat: cujus reliquiae aut ad conservandum modico loculo absque aliqua injuria facilius conserventur; aut, si ad consumendum fuerit necessarium, non ventrem illius qui sumpserit gravis farciminis onere premat. . . ." (Hard. *Conc.* iii. 1797.)

[3] *Can.* 2. "Dictum est nobis quod quidam presbyteri, celebrata missa, detrectantes ipsi sumere divina mysteria quas consecrarunt, calicem domini mulierculis, quae ad missas offerunt, tradant, vel quibusdam laicis qui

As communions at the weekday masses, at least, grew less and less frequent, and therefore it might often happen that a considerable portion of the sacrament remained unconsumed, the expedient of giving the remains of the consecrated elements to innocent children came into use. There are references to this practice in writers and documents both in East and West.

Evagrius, in the sixth century, writes that this method was recognized as an ancient custom in Constantinople,[1] and according to Nicephorus Callistus the practice persisted until his times (*i.e.* the fourteenth century) in the East. He tells us that, when a child, he frequently received the sacrament in this way.[2]

As to the West, the first reference to the custom occurs in a canon of the Second Council of Mâcon (A.D. 585), which directs that innocent children should be brought fasting to the church for this purpose on Wednesdays and Fridays.[3] The exact meaning of the canon is not obvious;

dijudicare corpus domini nesciunt, id est, discernere inter cibum spiritualem atque carnalem. Quod quantum sit omni ecclesiasticae religioni contrarium pietas fidelium novit. Unde omnibus presbyteris interdicimus ut nullus in posterum hoc facere praesumat, sed aut ipse cum reverentia sumat, aut diacono aut subdiacono, qui ministri altaris sunt, colligenda tradat. . . ." (Hard. vi. 1. 205.)

As to the date of the series in which this occurs, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles* III. 1. pp. 287 f. Hardouin places it under the title *Rodomi Synodus Generalis*, and dates it A.D. 878. It is contained in Regino's collection, I. 202 (Wasserschleben).

Ancient Coptic constitutions forbid the laity even to cleanse the sacred vessels, but James of Edessa allows the laity to consume in wine any particles of the Eucharist which may have become mouldy by oversight. *Perpetuité de la Foy*, III. vii. (tom. IV. pp. 253, 255).

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 36. "Ἔθος παλαιὸν βούλεται ἀνὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν (πόλιν) ὅταν πολύ τι χρῆμα τῶν ἁγίων μερίδων τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐναπομείνοι παῖδας ἀφθόρους μεταπέμπτους γίγνεσθαι παρὰ τῶν ἐς χαμαιδιδασκάλου φοιτώντων καὶ ταῦτα κατεσθίειν."

[2] *Hist. Eccl.* xvii. 25.

[3] *Can.* 6. ". . . Quaecumque reliquiae sacrificiorum post peractam missam in sacrario supersederint, quarta vel sexta feria innocentes ab illo cujus interest ad ecclesiam adducantur, et, indicto eis jejunio, easdem reliquias conspersas vino percipiant." (Hard. iii. 459.)

The story of the little Jew, told by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Mirac. de Gloria Mart.* 10), which is sometimes referred to as an instance of this custom (at Jerusalem or Ephesus), seems, as a matter of fact, to have no bearing whatever on the subject, and to allude to the regular communion of children at the Liturgy. (*P.L.* lxxi. 714.)

it will bear more than one interpretation. No mention is made of the Sunday mass. The larger number of communicants on Sunday would naturally render this custom unnecessary on that day.

Scudamore[1] is mistaken in supposing that nothing more is heard of this practice in the West after the date of this council. It lingered in some dioceses for a considerable period. It was forbidden by a synod that is supposed to have been held under Odo of Paris about the year 1198, and as an additional precaution the distribution of such obleys as were not required for consecration was forbidden at the same time.[2] Even later than this the synods of Clermont (1268),[3] of le Mans, and of Bayeux (both held about 1300), found it needful to issue prohibitions touching this point.[4]

In some parts of the East they used to burn what remained of the consecrated species. Perhaps because of the associations natural to the minds of Jewish converts; this was at one time the custom of the Church of Jerusalem.

Hesychius († *c.* A.D. 438), in his comment upon the verse "And that which remaineth of the flesh and of the bread shall ye burn with fire" (*Lev.* viii. 32), says, "We shall see this same thing actually done in the Church, and that which happens to remain unconsumed committed to the fire; not only that which has been kept one or two or many days; for it was not this that the lawgiver commanded, but that which was left over he commanded to be burned."[5]

This method had passed out of common use in Jerusalem by the eleventh century, for the Cardinal Humbert, in his controversial treatise against the Greeks, says that the

[1] *N.E.* p. 897.

[2] praescript. 39. "Item districte praecipitur presbyteris ne hostias, licet non sacratas, dent pueris ullo modo. . . ." (Hard. vi. 2. 1945.)

[3] "Inhibemus presbyteris ne hostias non consecratas dent pueris, nisi in die paschae loco panis benedicti." (Hard. vii. 593.)

[4] *Syn. Baiocen.* 16. "Inhibemus presbyteris ne hostias sacras dent pueris ullo modo infra septennium constitutis." (Hard. vii. 1228.)

[5] *In Levit.* 11. "Sed hoc quod reliquum est de carnibus et panibus in igne incendi praecepit (*Lev.* viii. 32). Quod nunc videmus etiam sensibiliter in ecclesia fieri, ignique tradi quaecumque remanere contigerit inconsumpta, non omnino ea quae una die vel duabus aut multis servata sunt: sicut enim apparet non hoc legislator praecepit sed quod reliquum est incendi jubet." (*P.G.* xciii. 886.)

sacrament was reserved for the use of pilgrims in the churches of Jerusalem, and remarks that in his days it was not burnt, as was the custom elsewhere in the East."[1]

Lastly, a strange direction occurs among the ancient oriental documents translated by the author of *La Perpetuité de la Foy*—"If it happen that on a solemn feast some of the Eucharist remains over, it must be treated with reverence; and the following day it shall be divided among the priests who shall communicate therefrom. But if there is no one to consume it, it must be reverently buried somewhere, but not burnt—for the dignity of the holy Bodies forbids them to be burnt."[2]

With the exception of the practice of the Nestorians, who have ceased to make use of the reserved sacrament, the majority of these instances do not necessarily preclude reservation. They are to be understood as providing for the consumption of what is superfluous, after the needs of the people, including the reservation of the Eucharist for the sick, have been met.

F. ADMINISTRATION TO THE DEAD AND OTHER ABUSES

Certain customs involving the use of the sacrament, such as the deposition of consecrated Hosts in the structure of an altar at the consecration of a church,[3] the employment of the sacred species of Wine as writing fluid in subscribing the condemnations of heretics[4]—these we may pass over as

[1] *Adversus calumn. Graec.* 33. "Graeci autem cohabitantes eis alii sic, alii qualiter a suis acceperunt. Ad haec, si quid ex sancta et venerabili eucharistia in Hierosolymitanis ecclesiis superfuerit, nec incendunt nec in foveam mittunt, sed in pyxidem mundam recondunt et sequenti die communicant ex eo populum, quia quotidie communicant ibi, eo quod conveniunt illuc ex diversis provinciis Christiani qui propter fidem et maximum amorem Filii Dei communicare ibi desiderant, quia et locus ipse venerabilior et sanctior est omnibus locis in omni terra." (*P.L.* cxliii. 952.)

See his further remarks (*loc. cit.*): "Subterrare autem vel infodere sanctam eucharistiam in terra, sicut quidam dicuntur agere, aut in lagenam mittere, aut effundere illam, negligentia magna est et nullus timor dei."

[2] *op. cit.* III. 7 (tom. IV. p. 254).

[3] The ceremony appears first in the eighth century. Pontifical of Egbert of York. Surtees Soc. vol. xxvii. p. 46.

[4] As was done, *e.g.* at the condemnation of the Eutychian, Pyrrhus, by Pope Theodore (Theophan. *Chronographia*, ad ann. 621); and by the prelates who condemned Photius in A.D. 869 (Labbé, *Concilia*, viii. 1231).

foreign to our quest. They are not of early date, and so are of no value in tracing the origin and development of reservation for the sick. Neither need we relate the many wicked abuses that the curious may discover in mediaeval literature of the baser sort; for these abuses were most prevalent at a date when official reservation had become the universal custom.[1]

But it is necessary to take note of the use of the sacrament in connection with the dead, because some of these practices appeared in early times, and their existence witnesses to the freedom conceded to the laity and others in the matter of private reservation.

A distinction must first be made between the custom of burying the Eucharist with a corpse and the habit of attempting to communicate the departed.

(*a*) In the former we may have an extension of the use of the sacrament as an amulet. According to Balsamon, who writes as if it were only employed in the case of bishops, the object of this custom was to scare away evil spirits from disturbing the repose of the body.[2] He is certainly wrong in supposing that the sacrament was only interred with bishops, for, in the *Life of St. Benedict*, it is recorded that the saint took the following course of action to secure the repose of the body of a monk that would not remain buried. He produced a consecrated Host, and gave it to the dead man's parents, commanding them to lay it with all reverence upon the breast of the corpse and

[1] For example, in the pages of Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialog. Monachorum*.

[2] His opinion is cited thus in *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét. et de Liturgie* (s.v. Commun. des Morts), 2445: "Quod autem sanctus panis anstitibus post mortem tradatur, et sic sepeliantur, existimo hoc fieri ad avertendos daemonas, et ut per ipsum tamquam viaticum deducatur ad coelum, qui magna et apostolica professione dignus est habitus." This occurs as a comment on *Can.* 82 of the Council "in Trullo."

If this abuse originated in any other locality it may have come from Egypt, where superstition infected Christianity from the first. The Egyptian practice of providing food for the dead is well known, and a possibly intermediate step between the pagan custom and the Christianized form is furnished by the description of a gnostic (?) grave at Antinoë, in Scott Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, pp. 110 ff, 118, 119.

On the other hand, the gift of food to the departed was in some form or other well nigh universal and of ancient standing.

to proceed with the burial. This expedient, we are assured, had the desired effect.[1]

Little cases of gold, with rings at one side, were found inside coffins disinterred in the course of excavations made at the Vatican in 1571. Similar boxes were found in the oratory of St. Ambrose and elsewhere on the breasts of Christian bodies.[2] These *encolpia* were generally used to contain relics of written passages of the scriptures; and similar receptacles were worn on the person to bear about the Eucharist. It is not certainly known whether the sacrament was ever enclosed in these receptacles and buried in this manner with the dead, but it seems not improbable that in some cases this may have been done.

Exhumation of the bodies of ecclesiastics has often revealed the remains of obleys upon and about the corpse. Obleys were found on the breast of St. Cuthbert;[3] and Iso of St. Gall, who wrote in the ninth century, speaks of the finding of obleys upon and about the body of St. Othmarus († A.D. 759) on the occasion of its translation. "Under the head and about the breast of the man of God were certain little breads, such as are commonly called obleys." The bishop who presided over the translation "marvelled that they still remained incorrupt and unspoilt"; and he replaced some of them upon the body, while others were retained and preserved as curiosities in a pyx. It does not appear that these were consecrated Hosts, or even that the bishop believed them to be such.[4] Here, as in many other cases, the obleys had probably been buried as symbols of sacerdotal office, comparable with the chalice and paten that were laid in the grave with the bodies of mediaeval ecclesiastics.

The attempt to communicate the dead might well arise from familiarity with the custom of communicating the dying at the moment of departure. Reference is made to this habit as usual at Rome in the *Life of St. Melania*

[1] Gregory (*Dialog.* ii. 24). ". . . Manu sua protinus communionem dominici corporis dedit, dicens 'hoc dominicum corpus super pectus eius ponite et sic eum sepulturae tradite.'" (*P.L.* lxvi. 125 f.)

[2] Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*.

[3] Amalarius, *De eccles. offic.* iv. 41 (Hittorp, *Bibl. Patr.* x. 498). He claims the authority of Bede for this statement..

[4] *De Mirac. S. Othmari* I. 5. II. 1. (*P.L.* cxxi. 783, 792.)

the Younger († A.D. 437). She had already received the sacrament twice on the day that she died; and yet, at the last, the Bishop of Jerusalem (who was in attendance) placed a Host between her lips. "For," says the writer of her Life, "it is the custom of the Romans to take care that the sacrament is in the mouth at the moment that the soul departs."[1]

It is doubtful whether the well-known story, told by the pseudo-Amphilochius, of St. Basil of Caesarea, alludes to the communion of the dead or to the habit of burying the Eucharist with a corpse. He is said to have been inspired when celebrating the Liturgy, and in consequence to have divided the Host into three parts, one of which he consumed at the altar, another he placed in the dove that hung above the holy Table, and the third he reserved against his death. And this third portion was buried with him; but the words *ἐν τῷ στόματι* are probably interpolated by some one familiar with the custom to which the biographer of St. Melania refers.[2]

Speaking generally, however, there is no need to seek any other origin for the attempt to communicate the dead elsewhere than in mistaken notions of piety. The enactments that forbade it may have had in view more particularly the perpetuation of this abuse by ignorant clerks; but the layfolk would have opportunities of doing the same sort of thing as long as they were allowed to keep the Eucharist in their possession.

The Council of Hippo (A.D. 393) found it necessary to publish a canon forbidding both baptism and communion of the dead: "It is decreed that the Eucharist be not given to dead bodies. For the Lord's command was, 'Take ye, and eat'; but the bodies of the dead can neither take nor eat."[3] This prohibition was repeated,

[1] "Consuetudo autem est Romanis, ut cum animae egrediuntur, communio domini in ore sit."

Vita S. Melaniae; no. lv. in Rampolla y Tindaro, *Santa Melania giuniore* (quoted in *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.*, etc., 2446).

[2] *Vita S. Basilii*, ps.-Amphilochius (ninth century) cap. 6: "*καὶ διελὼν τὸν ἄρτον εἰς τρεῖς μερίδας τὴν μὲν μίαν μετέλαβη φόβῳ πολλῷ, τὴν δὲ ἐφύλαξε συνταφῆναι αὐτῷ, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐνθεὶς περιστερᾷ χρυσῷ ἐκρέμασεν ἐπάνω τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηρίου.*" (*Amphilochii Opera* (1644, Paris), p. 176.)

[3] *Can.* 8: "Item placuit, ut corporibus defunctorum eucharistia non detur. Dictum est a domino: *Accipite et edite.* Cadavera autem nec

along with other canons, by the synod held at Carthage in A.D. 525.[1]

The mind of the Church was constantly against the custom, but it was not easily extirpated. The question came up again before a Council of Auxerre in A.D. 578;[2] and St. Boniface included the canon of this council, *non licet mortuis eucharistiam nec osculum tradi*, in his collection of statutes for the German Church, nearly one hundred and fifty years later.[3]

That the abuse was not confined to the West is apparent from a canon put forth by the council, supplementary to the Fifth and Sixth Oecumenical Councils, which is distinguished by the title "*in Trullo.*" The eighty-third canon is in effect a transcription of that enacted on this point at Hippo.[4]

accipere possunt nec edere. Cavendum est etiam ne mortuos etiam baptizari posse fratrum infirmitas credat, cum eucharistiam mortuis non dari animadverterit." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* II. pt. 1, p. 86.) Hard. i. 961 (as Concil. Carthag. iii. A.D. 397. *Can.* 6).

[1] Hard. ii. 1078.

[2] *Can.* 12: "Non licet mortuis nec eucharistiam nec osculum tradi. . . ." (Hard. iii. 445.) Unction of and kissing the corpse is described in the pseudo-Dionysian *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, c. 7, late fifth century.

[3] *Cap.* 20. (Hard. iii. 1943.) cf. Instructions in *ordo ad visitandum infirmum* of Theodulf of Orleans: "Hoc autem omnibus modis observari oportet, ut post mortem communio eucharistiae in os cadaveris (non) immittatur aliquo intuitu misericordiae: quod prohibent valde canones." (Mart. *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. viii, art. 4, ord. 2.) The *Responsio ad Rusticum Narbonensem*, an Isidorian fabrication, makes St. Leo state that the practice was forbidden (c. 8): "Nos autem quibus viventibus non communicavimus, mortuis communicare non possumus. . . ." (Hinschius, p. 17.) This was in reply to the question whether it were lawful to communicate penitents who had died without *viaticum*.

[4] *Can.* 83: "μηδεὶς τοῖς σώμασι τῶν τελευτώντων τῆς εὐχαριστίας μεταδιδότω. . . ." (Hard. iii. 1691.)

PART II

OFFICIAL RESERVATION FOR THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK

CHAPTER VIII

Official Reservation during the First Six Centuries

OF the practices and customs associated with the reserved Eucharist so far reviewed some were purely ceremonial. For the most part, however, we have been concerned with temporary expedients of a practical sort that were suppressed, or at least became obsolete, when the conditions that were the occasion of their first appearance had passed away. Such expedients as these lingered on locally and in special circumstances, or might reappear from time to time. But in general they were forbidden by the Church as irregularities and even as abuses, after the real need for them had ceased to exist. But to minister to the necessities of the sick and dying remained a constant obligation ; and we have now to turn our attention to the history of that method of providing for clinical communion which finally superseded all others ; that is to say, the official reservation of the Eucharist. In this matter, as always, ecclesiastical authority studied practical convenience accompanied with decency and order. Moreover, practical considerations, it is well to remember, are usually antecedent to theoretical reasons in cases where changing circumstances demand a modification of existing practice.

A handy division of the history of the official reservation of the Eucharist for regular clinical use may be made by throwing the material bearing upon the subject into three periods. The first of these closes with the end of the sixth century, and is the age of the Fathers ; the second covers the early Middle Ages, from the seventh century to the beginning of the tenth ; while the eucharistic controversies in the eleventh century form a natural landmark for the opening of the third period. It will not be necessary, for reasons given in the preface, to follow the history of the practice beyond the date of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).

Between the last waves of persecution there were intervals of comparative peace and freedom during which Christians were able to lay aside to some extent that extreme secrecy and caution that in earlier and more perilous times had accompanied the administration of the sacraments. When they were allowed openly to erect and to use buildings of their own, provision was made on an adequate scale for dealing with the multitudes that sought and obtained admission into the Church. For example, the development in complexity of the rite of baptism and the architectural evolution of the baptistery reflect, not an increase in the importance attached to the sacrament, but the greater publicity which was the natural consequence of the administration of baptism to ever-increasing numbers. The Liturgy, in the same way, expanded and grew more elaborate as it became more and more conspicuously the great public service of the rapidly Christianizing State. The partial secrecy that still surrounded the central mysteries had now become part of the discipline of the catechumenate rather than an attempt to hide the Christian worship from the eyes of the world.

It is reasonable to suppose, then, that a similar development would take place in connection with the provision made for the communion of the sick and dying. The recognition of their wants would undoubtedly lead in time, under the new conditions, to the regular and official reservation of the sacrament. In the larger centres of Christianity, at least, the need of furnishing that which had always been regarded as the indispensable preparation for death would be a pressing problem.

But it must be acknowledged that evidence of a satisfactory kind for the official reservation of the sacrament is extraordinarily scanty; and the task before us resolves itself into the elimination of mistaken or doubtful references to the custom rather than the discovery of further information on this subject. It may be well to begin, therefore, by clearing away certain passages that have been mistakenly cited as containing allusions to the custom; and then to proceed with the consideration of those which seem to afford definite information.

There is first a passage in St. Gregory Nazianzen[1] to

[1] *Orat.* viii. (in laudem Gorgoniae) 18. Ed. Bened. 1778, p. 229.

which a brief reference may be made here; but as it has been chiefly prominent in controversy concerning the antiquity of the *cultus* of the reserved sacrament, a fuller discussion of its meaning is deferred until we come to deal with that question.[1] Certain statements made by St. Gregory in the funeral sermon which he preached on the occasion of his sister's death (*c.* A.D. 380) have been taken to mean that the Eucharist was at that period reserved on or near the altars of churches. Here it is only necessary to remark that the ambiguity of the passage excludes it from being used as witness for official reservation.

Nor may we retain any longer as evidence in this inquiry two expressions that are to be found in Optatus's treatise against the Donatists. It is true that he asks, "What else is the altar but the seat (*sedes*) of the Body and Blood of Christ?" And lower down in the same chapter he says of the holy Table that it is "the place where Christ's Body used to dwell (*habitabat*)." At first sight, and divorced from their context, these expressions might well seem to imply that the sacrament was there in some form reserved. But, though they have been taken to carry this sense, the context clearly shows that the presence recognized at the altar is associated with the actual celebration of the Liturgy, and not with any sort of reservation.[2]

A letter of St. Ambrose to Felix, Bishop of Como, is concerned with the forthcoming consecration of a basilica, and herein the worship of the Church is represented in terms of the religion of the tabernacle. In spite of the fact that St. Ambrose compares the furniture of the ancient sanctuary, not with the actual ornaments of a Christian church, but with the ideals and principles of Christian religion, one detail in this passage is sometimes quoted as evidence for the reservation of the Eucharist in the churches of that age. "There," he says, "is the ark of the covenant covered on all sides with gold; that is to say,

[1] See Appendix, *The origins of extra-liturgical Cultus of the Eucharist*, p. 256.

[2] *De schism. Donat.* vi. 1.: "quid enim est altare? Sedes et corporis et sanguinis. . . ." "Ubi corpus Christi habitabat." But these must be interpreted by "quod vos offenderat Christus, cuius illic per certa (*al.* caetera) momenta corpus et sanguis habitabat," which occurs lower down. (*P.L.* xi. 1066.)

the doctrine of Christ, the doctrine of the wisdom of God. There is *the pot of gold containing the manna*, that is, *the receptacle of spiritual food* and the repository of divine knowledge. There is Aaron's rod, typical of priestly grace," [1] and so on. The whole passage is clearly too metaphorical to be used in argument for the antiquity of reservation in a church; and the most that can be said of it is that the parallel would be specially appropriate if the custom of keeping the sacrament in a vessel of some sort were in existence at that time.

Perhaps the most familiar passage of all is that which occurs in the letter sent by St. John Chrysostom to Pope Innocent I. He deplores the scenes of sacrilege which were enacted in his cathedral of St. Sophia during the Holy Week of A.D. 403. Soldiers sent by the Empress Eudoxia (whom Chrysostom had offended by his condemnation of feminine extravagance) entered into the church on Easter Even at the time when baptism was being administered; and, not content with this demonstration, they pushed through the crowds of worshippers to the innermost recesses of the building, "in which confusion," St. Chrysostom says, "the most holy Blood of Christ was spilled upon the soldiers' clothes." [2]

Now it is evident that these outrages did not take place during the Liturgy, because there were catechumens in the church that Sunday waiting to be baptized. The solemn rite of baptism would precede the Liturgy of the Easter Vigil, and therefore the mention of the spilling of the sacred Blood has been claimed as proof of the regular reservation of the sacrament, in both kinds, at the cathedral at Constantinople in the fifth century.

[1] *Epist.* iv. 4. "Ibi est arca testamenti undique auro tecta, id est, doctrina Christi, doctrina sapientiae dei. Ibi dolium aureum habens manna; receptaculum scilicet spiritalis alimoniae et divinae promptuarium cognitionis. Ibi virga Aaron insigne sacerdotalis gratiae. . . ." (*P.L.* xvi. 891.)

[2] *Epist.* I. *ad Innocent. Papam.* 3. ". . . ἀλλ' ἔνθα τὰ ἅγια ἀπέκειντο εἰσελθόντες οἱ στρατιῶται ὧν ἔνιοι καθὼς ἔγνωμεν ἀμύητοι ἦσαν πάντα τε ἑώρων τὰ ἔνδον καὶ τὸ ἁγιώτατον αἷμα τοῦ χριστοῦ ὡς ἐν τοσούτῳ θορύβῳ εἰς τὰ τῶν προειρημένων στρατιωτῶν ἱμάτια ἐξεχεῖτο. . . ." (*Opera* (ed. Gaume) iii. 618.)

The letter containing the account of this incident is incorporated in Palladius' *Life of St. John Chrysostom* (Gaume xiii. 9).

But for such a conclusion there is no adequate ground. Almost certainly the sacrament had been consecrated two days before (on Maundy Thursday), to serve for the communion of the faithful on Good Friday, and for that of the newly-baptized on Easter Even; for it was, of course, the custom at this period to receive communion immediately after initiation.

It was therefore to meet the special needs of this season that the Eucharist was kept in the basilica: the passage yields no evidence for what we are in search of—the practice of constant reservation for the sick.

So, again, it is in connection with the observance of the *Cena Domini* that St. Mary of Egypt is said to have received her *viaticum.* She lived in the fourth century, but the narrative of her last communion belongs to the seventh. It is doubtful, therefore, whether the details are altogether reliable.

Some time before her end St. Mary is represented as making her request to the Abbot Zosimas that on the evening of Maundy Thursday he should come into the desert and bring her "the sacred vessel of the life-giving Body and Blood of Christ." Her wishes were fulfilled when the day came round. Zosimas did as he was bidden, and, taking a portion of the sacrament (*parvum poculum intemerati corporis ac venerandi sanguinis Christi*), he set out for the bank of the Jordan, where the saint had arranged to meet him.[1]

This is virtually an instance of coincident communion; the sacrament was carried out from the evening Liturgy, immediately after the service was over. It is also interesting to notice that the communion was apparently administered on this occasion in the two kinds conjointly.

St. Jerome, whose witness to the habit of private reservation has been considered, is quoted as evidence for reservation of the official sort as well. This may be, and probably is, implied in the reference to Exsuperius of Toulouse; [2] but there would be no ambiguity at all about the matter if a passage commonly cited from his works were genuine. In his *Commentary on Ezekiel xl*, where he mystically interprets the structure of the ideally reconstituted temple, and in particular the little chambers

[1] Boll. *AA.SS.*, April 2nd. [2] Vide p. 62.

(παστοφόρια, ἐξέδραι) annexed thereto, the following passage is said to occur: "And therefore, the sacristy in which is laid the Body of Christ, Who is the true Bridegroom of the Church and of our souls, is well called the bridal-chamber (*thalamus*) or *pastophorium*."[1]

There are indeed points in his exegesis of this and other chapters where such a note would come in very appropriately; but, as a matter of fact, it does not appear that he makes this or any similar remark.

There is a passage in the works of St. Paulinus of Nola († A.D. 431) which has been held to provide the evidence that Jerome proves unable to supply. Writing to Bishop Severus of Mileum a description of the church of St. Felix at Nola, he mentions, among other features of the building, the double *secretaria* (παστοφόρια), one on either side of the apse. Above the entrance of each he had had inscribed a couplet. Over the door of the left-hand sacristy there were written verses that may be paraphrased thus:—

> "He who is moved by the holy desire to meditate upon the Law
> Here may sit and ponder the sacred books."

In other words, this was the library. The corresponding verses over the opposite door were these:—

> "Hic locus est veneranda penus qua conditur et qua
> Promitur alma sacri pompa ministerii."[2]

The association of *veneranda penus* and *conditur* seems to have been responsible for the citing of this passage. *Penus*, of course, usually means a supply of food; but here it has the rarer signification of a shrine; and the verse must be understood simply to mean that the right-hand sacristy was the place where the clergy vested, and whence the processions started. Even if we are to suppose that the lines contained an allusion to reservation of the Eucharist in the

[1] "Quare sacrarium in quo jacet corpus Christi qui verus est ecclesiae et animarum nostrarum sponsus, proprie thalamus seu παστοφόριον appellatur." This passage, which is no doubt a later marginal note that has become incorporated in some texts of Jerome, is frequently quoted by ecclesiologists of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, *e.g.* Durantus, Martène, etc., and is referred to as authentic in *A Catholic Dictionary*, Addis and Arnold.

[2] *Epist.* (32) *ad Severum*. (*P.L.* lxi. 338.)

sacristy,[1] the context would show the reference to be rather to reservation for a liturgical purpose than for communion of the sick.[2] We must look for better evidence than this.

More satisfactory, perhaps, than anything noticed hitherto is a further passage from Optatus. At the time when he wrote, *i.e.* about the year A.D. 365, the Catholics of Africa were complaining bitterly of the outrages perpetrated in their churches by the Donatist schismatics, who, by permission of Julian, had returned exultant from their exile. Optatus accused their leaders of ordering the Eucharist, the sacred Body, he says, to be cast out to the dogs; and tells of the strange vengeance that overtook the guilty agents of the sacrilege.[3] Now it is doubtless possible that these profane irruptions took place during the celebration of the Liturgy; but the fact that the Donatists are also charged with throwing away the *ampullae* containing the chrism suggests that they were accustomed to break into the churches out of mass time, and to ransack the *sacraria* where the sacred vessels (and, it may be, the sacrament) were stored. The use of the phrase *corpus sanctum* is possibly noteworthy, and should be contrasted with the mention of both species in other passages from this author given above. In the next century the Vandals came to the Province and set up a kingdom there. Catholics fared as ill under the rule of these Arian barbarians as during the Donatist outbursts; and accordingly we find a repetition of their troubles. The churches were invaded at the time of communion, and the Eucharist was trampled under foot;[4] but when

[1] Vacant and Mangenot (*op. cit.* (37), p. 1204. *s.v.* Eucharistie) leave the question undecided. The note appended to the passage in Migne (*u.s.*) favours the view that the allusion is to the preparation of persons and materials for the Liturgy.

[2] St. Paulinus himself, at his end, had mass said by his bedside. See p. 25.

[3] *De Schism. Donat.* II. 19: "Jusserunt eucharistiam canibus fundi, non sine signo divini judicii: nam eidem canes accensi rabie ipsos dominos quasi latrones sancti corporis reos dente vindici tamquam ignotos et inimicos laniaverunt." (*P.L.* xi. 972.)

[4] Victor Vitensis, *De persecut. Vandal.* I. 13: "tempore quo sacramenta dei populo porrigebantur introeuntes maximo cum furore corpus Christi et sanguinem pavimento sparserunt et illud pollutis pedibus calcaverunt." (*P.L.* lviii. 198.)

we are told that Valerian, Bishop of Abbenza, was exiled in consequence of his refusal to surrender the "divine sacraments" at the bidding of the emissaries of Gieseric, it may be that a reference to the reserved sacrament underlies this ambiguous remark.[1]

As for the East, at an earlier date (*c.* A.D. 343) Lucius of Hadrianople was responsible—if his Eusebian opponents are to be believed—for acts of sacrilege resembling those of the Donatists in Africa. They charge him with commanding, after his reinstatement in his see, that "the sacrifice consecrated by holy and valid priests" should be thrown out into the streets.[2]

From Alexandria, where the private habit was common, we have at least one satisfactory piece of evidence for the existence of official reservation in the story of Serapion's last communion. This is related at length at an earlier page,[3] and there is no need to repeat it here. It is unlikely that when once the custom had come into use it would ever be discarded.[4]

Possibly, it was the practice of official reservation that occasioned one of the misbeliefs of the Anthropomorphites which St. Cyril of Alexandria is eager to condemn. In a letter to Bishop Calosyrius he dismisses the contention of these heretics that the effect of consecration on the matter of the Eucharist is merely temporary. "I hear," he says, "that they assert that the mystical blessing fails to secure consecration if any portion remain until another day. They are mad who make such statements; for Christ is never other than Himself, nor does His holy Body suffer change, but the virtue of the blessing and the life-giving grace remain constantly in it."[5] It is clear that

[1] *ibid.* I. 12: "tunc etiam sanctus Valerianus Abbenzae civitatis episcopus, dum viriliter sacramenta divina ne traderet dimicasset, foras civitatem singularis jussus est pelli." (*u.s.* 197.)

[2] Hilary of Poitiers, *Opus Hist. frag.* III. 9: "post reditum suum sacrificium a sanctis et integris sacerdotibus confectum, si fas est dicere, canibus projiciendum jubebat." (*P.L.* x. 665.)

[3] See p. 13.

[4] Palladius, in his *Life of St. John Chrysostom*, charges Theophilus of Alexandria with having burnt a monastic establishment, and states that the sacrament (τὰ σύμβολα τῶν μυστηρίων) was destroyed in the fire.

[5] *Adv. Anthropomorph.* 1: "ἀκούω δὲ ὅτι εἰς ἁγιασμὸν ἀπρακτεῖν φάσιν τὴν μυστικὴν εὐλογίαν εἰ ἀπομένοι λείψανον αὐτῆς εἰς ἑτέραν ἡμέραν. μαίνονται δὲ ταῦτα λέγοντες· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοιοῦται χριστὸς οὐδὲ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα μεταβληθήσεται, ἀλλ' ἡ τῆς εὐλογίας δύναμις καὶ ἡ ζωοποιὸς χάρις διηνεκής ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῷ." (*P.G.* lxxvi. 1074, 1075.)

some kind of reservation is in question, but whether it be official and public, or of the private sort, cannot be decided.

The Alexandrine *Canons of Athanasius*, for the nucleus of which some degree of authenticity is claimed, contain a prohibition which seems to presuppose the frequent use of the Eucharist reserved in church. "No priest shall carry forth the mysteries and go with them about the streets, except for a sick man, when the end and death's hour of need draw nigh. And when they carry the mysteries (without) they shall suffer none but the sick to partake. And they shall not do according to favour and give unto any beside the sick, but unto the sick alone. And if any constrain them that they should give him of the mysteries, he shall be unto him as he that hid his lord's money in the earth, because that he favoured not the Church. Let him go thither and not be sluggish, for there is no need."[1] Here we have symptoms of the policy of restriction in the matter of private communion. Hitherto the Church of Alexandria had been characterized by great leniency in this matter.

To return to the West. At a later date, Caesarius of Arles (A.D. 501–542), or whoever wrote a certain sermon attributed to him, warns the people against flying for aid in sickness to magical and heathen rites, and urges them to look rather to the sacraments for help. "Whenever a malady overtakes any one of you, let him receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and then let him anoint his body";[2] this was the regular order of the two sacraments—communion and unction—at that period. Elsewhere he says, in a similar context: "How much better and

[1] (*Can.* 36.) Arabic version (translation). Riedel and Crum, *Canons of Athanasius* (Text & Transl. Socy. 1904), pp. 32, 33. (For discussion of authenticity see pp. xiv–xxvi.)

[2] *Sermo.* 265: "Quotiens aliqua infirmitas supervenerit, corpus et sanguinem Christi ille qui aegrotat accipiat; et inde corpusculum suum unguat, ut illud quod scriptum est impleatur in eo, infirmatur aliquis, inducat presbyteros, etc. . . . Videte, fratres, quia qui in infirmitate ad ecclesiam cucurrerit et corporis sanitatem recipere, et peccatorum indulgentiam merebitur obtinere." (*Append. ad. tom. v Operum S. Augustini*, edit. Benedict. 437.)

more wholesome is it for people to have recourse to the church, to receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and to anoint themselves or their friends with the blessed oil!"[1] The admonition to "run to the church" can hardly be taken literally; for obviously the invalid cannot be expected to go and fetch his own *viaticum*. It seems that we have here a medicinal use of the Eucharist, supplementing an administration of unction that expects the recovery of the patient. All that may be concluded from these two passages is that the reserved sacrament is probably intended; and nothing more precise is discoverable in the incident related by Anastasius Bibliothecarius of one Philip (*c.* A.D. 597) who, in anticipation of sudden death, sought to receive communion in the night time.[2]

The works of St. Gregory the Great furnish evidence for the custom of private reservation,[3] but contain no unmistakeable reference to the official use of the reserved Eucharist for the sick. He touches upon the discipline of the last communion of penitents without informing us whether the sacrament was reserved against such contingencies. All that is proved by these and other allusions to *viaticum* in his writings is that people looked to be houselled at the time of their death. In addition to the well-known instance of St. Benedict,[4] he tells, for example, of a woman named Romula living under a religious rule, who, before she died, called in the night for the head of the community, and asked for the Eucharist.[5] This may suggest that the sacrament was kept ready to hand by authority, but such a conclusion is precarious. Nor again, in the case of another religious, the hour of whose death had been made known to him previously,

[1] *Sermo.* 279: "Quantum rectius et salubrius erat ut ad ecclesiam currerent, corpus et sanguinem Christi acciperent, oleo benedicto et se et suos fideliter perungerent; et secundum quod Jacobus apostolus dicit, non solum sanitatem corporum sed etiam remissionem acciperent peccatorum." (*op. cit.* 465.)

[2] *Hist. Eccl.* (Chronographia Tripart). (*P.G.* cviii. 886.)

[3] See pp. 62, 63.

[4] *Dialog.* II. 37: "sexta die portari se in oratorium a discipulis fecit, ibique exitum suum dominici corporis et sanguinis perceptione munivit." (*P.L.* lxvi. 202.)

[5] *Dialog.* IV. 5: "Nocte igitur quarta eamdem magistram suam iterum vocavit; qua veniente, viaticum petiit et accepit." (*P.L.* lxxvii. 345.)

can more be learnt than that he received at the last "the mystery of the Body and Blood of the Lord."[1]

Finally, we note that in making provision for the regular consumption of the Eucharist that remained in the sacristy the Council of Mâcon (A.D. 585) seems implicitly to enjoin the renewal of the reserved sacrament during the week; and further, from the injunction that its consumption was to be facilitated by the use of common wine, that the Bread alone is in question.[2]

It must be confessed that although these few and scattered passages go some little way toward establishing the fact that in the sixth and preceding centuries the Eucharist was here and there officially reserved, they fail entirely to place beyond doubt the existence of any general practice of this sort. Nor have we been able to decide in what form and in what manner the reserved sacrament was commonly employed for clinical communions.

1. There are, however, some considerations which supplement the meagre information at our disposal. From these it would appear that the practice of official reservation was more usual during this period than might otherwise be supposed.

(*a*) In the first place, the notion of periodical reservation for official and public occasions was not unfamiliar to the Early Church. *Eulogiae* were sent from bishop to bishop in the days of Irenaeus; the *Fermentum* is said to have been introduced into Rome in the fourth century; the beginnings of the *Sancta* are obscure but may be of early date. Indeed, unless we are prepared to maintain that the *turres* which formed usual gifts to churches in the fourth and succeeding centuries were always, like the early forms of the *columbae*, merely symbolical ornaments, we must suppose them to have been used for some kind of

[1] *ibid.* 35: "Cumque decrescentes quotidie computaret dies, ante triduum quam vocaretur ex corpore, febre correptus est. Ad horam vero mortis veniens, mysterium dominici corporis et sanguinis accepit." (*P.L. u.s.* 377.)

[2] *Can.* 6: "Quaecumque reliquiae sacrificiorum post peractam missam in sacrario supersederint quarta vel sexta feria innocentes ab illo cuius interest, ad ecclesiam adducantur, et indicto eis jejunio, easdem reliquias conspersas vino percipiant." (Hard. iii. 462.) The use of unconsecrated wine in private communion from the reserved sacrament is considered by Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine*, pp. 229, 339 ff.

reservation, either in connection with the ceremonies of the Liturgy or for extra-liturgical communion.[1] There was no general dislike of reserving the Eucharist, provided that the elementary conditions of reverence and seemliness could be secured. It is true that occasional opposition to reservation in any form or for any purpose is made by heretics who deny the permanence of the effect of consecration;[2] and from time to time objection might arise in quarters where the correspondence between the Eucharist and the paschal sacrifice or the manna of the wilderness had impressed itself strongly on men's minds. From the last point of view a show of argument against any form of the practice might indeed be maintained; hence we are not surprised to find in Origen possible disapproval of reservation,[3] and indications of the same attitude in the *Sahidic Canons*[4] and the pseudo-Clementine *Epistle to James*.[5] But on the whole there were no reasons, either practical or theoretical, why the practice should not develop in answer to actual needs.

(*b*) Secondly, if we study the early canons dealing with the communion of the sick, and, more especially, those concerned with the *viaticum* of persons under penitential discipline, the language of these enactments points to the conclusion that even while considerable freedom was still allowed to the faithful in the matter of private reservation, the administration of the last communion had already been brought under the strict control of the clergy. A certain licence in this direction that could be safely accorded to a laity, disciplined by the possession of high ideals and by the stress of more or less constant peril, was naturally withdrawn in view of the problems presented by the crowds of penitents who had lapsed as the result of the later intermittent persecutions.

A continuation of the same policy of restriction was demanded when the imperial recognition of Christianity led to an unavoidable relaxation of discipline and a general declension in Christian standards. It was essential in these circumstances that the administration of *viaticum* should be closely guarded by the local ecclesiastical authority.

From a very early date the bishop was supposed to be

[1] See chap. xiv. [2] See p. 112. [3] See p. 35. [4] See p. 94. [5] See p. 93.

informed of penitents in sickness or in danger of death; and as the severity of the discipline imposed depended upon his ruling, so the indulgence granted to the penitent *in extremis* was largely determined by the same authority. It was by the bishop's will that permission to communicate was granted or withheld. For example, the Council of Nicaea treated "the ancient and canonical law" of communicating the dying penitent as a matter that lay within the control of the bishop of the local church; and the same principle was asserted by other ecclesiastical pronouncements of the age.[1] Such considerations as these are in themselves no proof of the existence of official reservation; the conditions stated or assumed in regard to the administration of clinical communion are compatible with other expedients, such as distribution from the public service or private celebrations.

But the policy that they indicate is an important circumstance in ascertaining the origins of the custom of reserving the Eucharist officially for the houselling of the sick; and we have seen reason to believe that the extension of the open communion by distribution to the absent was generally discarded at an early date, and that private celebrations were not commonly favoured by authority.

(*c*) To what extent the desire for frequent communion operated in this direction we have already tried to determine. But even if the piety of the laity led to provision for frequent communion at synaxes of a non-liturgical character, this factor could only have been operative during a comparatively short period. For a general falling away from the habit of frequent communion marked the fifth and the following centuries, and the communion of the Presanctified became confined to special occasions. If, before this date, arrangements had been made whereby the people might communicate at other times than in the celebration of the Liturgy, it seems fair to suppose that some constant form of providing for the more pressing needs of the sick would have also come into existence.

We may, then, set down these provisional conclusions. From the third century onwards, that is during a period when persecution alternated with times of comparative safety, the discipline of the lapsed and penitent Christians

[1] See p. 7.

made official regulation of *viaticum* necessary. Such use of the reserved Eucharist for this purpose as was controlled by ecclesiastical authority could not be termed private, even if by reason of the circumstances of the time it was needful to keep the sacrament in secret, borne upon the person or hidden elsewhere. If the Eucharist was reserved at all in this restricted manner, it was reserved by the authority of the local church for the people's needs. So we see in the case of Serapion that the dying penitent applies to the priest for reconciliation sealed by communion. To all intents and purposes the principle of official reservation was in existence; and after the peace of the Church had become established, it is noteworthy that among the earliest ornaments of the basilica is the eucharistic *turris*.

2. As to the further question whether the Eucharist thus officially reserved and administered was kept in one or both kinds, since the origin of the practice is the result of restriction of the private habit, in which the Bread alone was employed, the use of the one species would naturally be perpetuated. This is implied in some of our passages, where only the Body is mentioned. The use of the single species was, indeed, associated with other occasions than private communion; *e.g.* the *Eulogiae* and the *Fermentum*. Nor do we lack witness for the employment of the Host without the consecrated Wine when for purposes of convenience this mode of communion was thought expedient. St. Gregory the Great tells of Pope Agapetus carrying the Body of the Lord from the altar in order to restore to perfect health a lame and dumb man.[1] We are perhaps justified also in concluding that the Manichees were able to communicate along with Catholics without exciting remark until this dissimulation on their part was checked by St. Leo's insistence upon the necessity of always receiving in both kinds at the public communion.[2]

[1] *Dialog.* iii. 3: ". . . cui dum in virtute dei, ex auctoritate Petri, fixam salutis illius spem habere se dicerent, protinus venerandus vir orationi incubuit, et missarum solemnia exorsus, sacrificium in conspectu dei omnipotentis immolavit. Quo peracto, ab altare exiens, claudi manum tenuit, atque assistente et aspiciente populo, eum mox a terra in propriis gressibus erexit. Cumque ei dominicum corpus in os mitteret, illa diu muta ad loquendum lingua soluta est." (*P.L.* lxxvii. 224.)

[2] *Serm.* xlii. 5: ". . . cumque ad tegendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse conventibus, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant ut interdum, ne penitus latere non possint, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiant; sanguinem autem redemptionis nostrae haurire omnino declinent. Quod ideo vestrae notum facimus sanctitati, ut vobis huiuscemodi homines et his manifestentur indiciis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur." (*P.L.* liv. 279 f.)

The decree in Gratian III, *de consecrat.* ii. 12) attributed to Pope Gelasius († A.D. 496) is to the same effect: "aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur." (*P.L.* clxxxvii. 1736.)

For other passages bearing on the point of *communio sub specie panis soli* see Vacant-Mangenot, *Dict. de théol. cathol.* III. 555–556, art. *Communion sous les deux espèces*; and Cabrol-Leclercq, *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.* art. *Communion sous une seule espèce.* As an example we may cite Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Francor.* x. 8. (*P.L.* lxxi. 535), where reception of the Eucharist is proposed by a bishop of Arvernes as the test of the innocence of a man popularly accused of parricide: "Tu vero si idoneus es, ut asseris, accede proprius et sume tibi eucharistiae particulam atque impone ori tuo." Is the omission of any mention of the Wine significant?

The fact that reservation of both species was at first the rule for communion in the "Presanctified"[1] does not affect the question, because there the point of portability had not been considered; and whatever we may think of the evidence usually cited for the use of the Host alone in other circumstances, for sick communions at a distance from the church the use of the chalice must always have been a standing difficulty.[2] So far we must also remember, no trustworthy evidence has been found for the existence of that kind of intinction in which both sacramental elements are employed.[3]

We conclude, therefore, that during the period which we have surveyed, the consecrated Bread alone was commonly used in official reservation. Those passages in which mention is made of both eucharistic species are probably to be explained as referring to *viaticum* administered otherwise than by the reserved sacrament,[4] or they may be merely instances of inexactness of diction.

[1] See p. 88.

[2] See, however, p. 62, for the case of Exsuperius of Toulouse.

[3] The use of intinction is implied in certain accounts (of seventh-century and later idate) of the communion of religious in the desert. cf. the *viaticum* of St. Mary of Egypt (p. 109).

[4] "Caesarius Arelat.," *Serm.* 265, 279; Greg. Magn. *Dialog.* II. 37; IV. 35.

CHAPTER IX

Official Reservation in the Early Middle Ages

BY following the common custom of reckoning the first six centuries together as an age by itself, it has been possible to sum up the evidence of that period, and to come to some tentative conclusions as to the origin and prevalence of official reservation of the Eucharist. This will help to carry us through the two hundred years of transition between the days of Gregory the Great and those of Charlemagne.

The seventh and the eighth centuries form the first half of the period that we have now to consider. This period, the early Middle Ages, is made up of two clearly-marked divisions of approximately equal length: the first is characterized by the ebb in learning and culture that succeeded the high-tide of the Fathers; the second, by the recovery that followed for a while the Carolingian reforms. We will take the evidence of these two divisions separately.

The Seventh and Eighth Centuries

(*a*) The first division (*c.* A.D. 600–800) is, as regards our subject, an age of obscurity. It is still necessary to depend as largely upon supposition here as in the period that has just been discussed, for of direct evidence there is great scarcity. If the considerations proposed at the end of the last chapter have any value, we start with something approaching a conviction that official reservation for clinical communion in the one species of Bread was coming into common use, at any rate in certain localities. It does not seem possible to avoid the conclusion that a method which was so natural a development of the private custom, and had so many points of convenience to recommend it, must have been widely employed. We have found plentiful evidence for the existence of private reservation by the clergy and the religious during this period. Official

reservation only differs from the private form in that the supply and ministration of the sacrament are restricted to, and regularized by, the normal ecclesiastical authorities.

Nevertheless, the only direct reference to official reservation appears to be contained in a canon of the Sixteenth Council of Toledo (A.D. 693). This council turned its attention to a number of careless habits that had grown up among the clergy in connection with the bread used in the mass. In the canon dealing with these abuses allusion is made incidentally, but unmistakeably, to the practice of reserving the Eucharist. Whether it was reserved for the use of the sick, or for one of those liturgical ceremonies which have been described in Part I of this work, is open to question. The sense of the relevant passage in the canon is as follows:—

"No bread shall be prepared for use at the altar other than such as is whole and wheaten, and this shall be made with care. Nor shall it be too large, but of moderate size, according to ecclesiastical custom; so that whatever remains over may be kept for reservation in a small receptacle (*ad conservandum modico loculo . . . conserventur*) without risk of harm; or else, in case it seem necessary, may be consumed" without inconvenience.[1]

For whatever purpose it was intended to be used, it will be noticed that the Bread alone is mentioned as being reserved;[2] and this, so far as it goes, bears out the conclusions reached at the end of the last chapter as to the usage of the preceding period. Some little light is thrown upon the question by the canons of two other councils of this age, which dealt with the ministration of the Eucharist, and issued rulings that touch, though only indirectly, upon the matter of our inquiry. First, an earlier (Eleventh)

[1] *Can.* 6. ". . . Unde temeritatis hujus aut nescientiae cupientes terminum ponere, id unanimitatis nostrae delegit conventus, ut non aliter panis in altari domini sacerdotali benedictione sanctificandus proponatur nisi integer et nitidus, qui ex studio fuerit praeparatus; neque grande aliquid sed modica tantum oblata, secundum quod ecclesiastica consuetudo retentat; cujus reliquiae aut ad conservandum modico loculo absque aliqua injuria facilius conserventur, aut si ad consumendum fuerit necessarium, non ventrem illius qui sumpserit gravis farciminis onere premat, nec quod in digestionem vadat sed animam alimonia spirituali reficiat. . . ." (Hard. iii. 1797.)

[2] cf. *Can.* 6 of Council of Mâcon, p. 115.

Council of Toledo (A.D. 675) than that to which we have just referred concerned itself with the subject of clinical communion by publishing an explanation of a canon promulgated by the First Council held in the same city nearly three hundred years before (A.D. 400). This canon has been noticed in a former place as ordering the expulsion of those who did not immediately consume the sacrament they received at the open communion. Now the later council was at pains to make quite clear the real reason for this regulation—that it was aimed against sacrilege, and was not intended to apply to the case of the sick and others who had difficulty in swallowing the Host. After referring to the physical weakness of persons in extreme sickness, the canon goes on to remark that in many cases "those who earnestly desire the *viaticum* of Holy Communion reject the Eucharist brought to them by the priest; not because they act in unbelief, but because they cannot swallow the Eucharist that is given them, apart from a draught from the chalice of the Lord." [1]

The interest of this passage is apparent. First, because the common use of the sole species of Bread is implied; and, secondly, because it is recognized that there are cases in which a draught from the chalice must, for physical

[1] *Can.* 11. "Cum nihil in divino canone debeat esse confusum, nihil dubium, nihil etiam indiscretum, in collatione nostrae coetus relatus est canon Toletani concilii primi, in quo praeceptum est ut si quis acceptam a sacerdote eucharistiam non sumpserit, velut sacrilegus propellatur; nec adjecta est ibi discretio voluntatum: cum et infidelis haec et talia infideliter agat, et fidelis fidenter accipiat quod naturalis illum necessitas deglutire non sinat. Solet enim humanae naturae infirmitas in ipso mortis exitu praegravata tanto siccitatis pondere deprimi ut nullus (sic) ciborum illationibus refici, sed vix tantumdem illati delectetur poculi gratia sustentari. Quod etiam in multorum exitu vidimus, qui optatum suis votis sacrae communionis expetentes viaticum, collatam sibi a sacerdote eucharistiam rejecerunt; non quod infidelitate hoc agerent sed quod praeter dominici calicis haustum, traditam sibi non possent eucharistiam deglutire. Non ergo hujusmodi a corpore ecclesiae separandi sunt qui talia non infidelitate sed necessitate fecerunt, praesertim hi de quibus nihil fidei sinistrae sentitur. Placuit ergo definire quod nec fideli officiat nec infideli inultum exsistat. Quicumque ergo fidelis inevitabili qualibet infirmitate coactus eucharistiam perceptam rejecerit in nullo ecclesiasticae damnationi subjaceat. Similiter nec illos cujusdam punitionis censura redarguet qui talia tempore infantiae faciunt, aut, in qualibet mentis alienatione positi, quid fecerint ignorare videntur . . ." (Hard. iii. 1028.)

reasons, accompany the delivery of the Host.[1] But exactly what is meant by the *dominici calicis haustum* [2] is not obvious. The Eucharist brought to them by the priest must, from the context, be taken to signify the Host alone; for it is this that the dying person cannot consume by itself. To suppose that the phrase *eucharistiam collatam sibi a sacerdote* includes the consecrated Wine would be to give to the term *eucharistia* two different meanings in two consecutive sentences. Moreover, against such an interpretation of the passage we have to consider not only the inconvenience and risk attached to carrying forth the chalice and its contents to any great distance from the church, but also the fact that whatever precise information can up to this point be adduced is practically all on the side of reservation in the one kind. How, then, is the reference to the chalice to be explained? There are two alternatives from which a choice may be made. We may suppose that when the council issued this canon it had in mind the substitution of communion at a private celebration, in or adjoining the sick-room, for the regular method of administering *viaticum*. Such celebrations, though unusual, were, as we have seen, by no means unknown; and they may have been allowed when, for the reasons stated in the canon, the use of the chalice was necessary.[3] But this interpretation hardly suits the phrase, "the Eucharist *brought* by the priest"; and if the substitution of a private celebration for the use of the reserved sacrament was intended, it is less clearly expressed than might have been expected.

It is possible, on the other hand, to understand that the draught accompanying the delivery of the Host (in this case reserved) was of unconsecrated liquid; and if this were the sense of the passage, it seems necessary to explain the use of the expression *calix dominicus* by the theory that

[1] That the canon gives permission to communicate the dying and others in the single species of wine can hardly be maintained without violence to the text. As notice is taken of infants who are unable to swallow the Host by itself, it may here be remarked that it is not until much later that we meet with definite and unambiguous injunctions to communicate infants under the species of Wine alone. See chap. xi.

[2] The use of *haustum* excludes the supposition that steeping the Host was intended.

[3] Private celebrations for the sick coexisted with reservation in Spain until the sixteenth century.

contact or admixture of the eucharistic Bread with unconsecrated wine hallowed the contents of the vessel employed. For the existence of this theory at so early a date we have no certain evidence, though it had a very general vogue for a time after the eighth century.[1]

While it must be admitted that no really satisfactory sense of the passage can be determined, it is none the less fairly evident that the use of the reserved species of Bread is regarded as normal in the administration of clinical communion.[2]

It is reasonable to suppose, however, that there was some diversity of practice. All manner of strange usages in connection with the Eucharist were to be found within the limits of Spain alone. The Third Council of Braga, sitting in the same year (A.D. 675) as the Eleventh Council of Toledo, published a canon concerning certain abuses of this sort, and included among them the use of intincted Hosts for communicating the people. The prohibition of intinction was based upon the fact that according to the Gospel account of the institution of the Eucharist the disciples received the Bread and the Wine separately, and to the traitor alone was given a sop, *intinctum panem* (*St. John* xiii. 26, Vulg.).[3]

[1] *Consecratio e contactu hostiae* may possibly be alluded to in a canon of the Council of Orange, held in A.D. 441. See pp. 149–152 below.

[2] This is also the case in the passage in a work of fifth-century date, formerly ascribed to Prosper of Aquitaine: "Manu igitur faciem eius sustentante sacerdote ne sanctum projiceret, a quodam diacono suggestum est, ut calicem salutarem gutturi eius pontifex applicaret: quod ut factum est statim ut locum illum quem diabolus obsederat salvatoris imperio reliquit, sacramentum quod ore gestabat, cum laude redemptoris transglutiisse puella clamavit." *Opera* (1609) p. 161. The invalid was given the Host, and this would have sufficed for communion if she could have swallowed it: but for physical reasons a little of the Wine was given in addition. The circumstances suppose a private celebration; it is strange that this incident should be thought to furnish an early example of intinction, *e.g.* by Scudamore, *N.E.* p. 1019.

[3] *Can.* 2. "Cum omne crimen atque peccatum oblatis deo sacrificiis deleatur, quid de cetero pro delictorum expiatione domino dabitur, quando in oblatione sacrificii erratur? Audivimus enim quosdam schismatica ambitione detentos contra divinos ordines et apostolicas institutiones lac pro vino in divinis sacrificiis dedicare; alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere: quosdam etiam non expressum vinum in sacramento dominici calicis offerre, sed oblatis uvis populos communicare. Quod quam sit evangelicae atque apostolicae doctrinae contrarium et consuetudini ecclesiasticae adversum non difficile ab ipso fonte veritatis probabitur, a quo ordinata sacramentorum mysteria processerunt. Cum enim magister veritatis verum salutis nostrae sacrificium suis commendaret discipulis, non illis lac sed panem tantum et calicem sub hoc sacramento benedixisse cognoscimus. Ait enim evangelica veritas: Accepit Jesus panem et calicem et benedicens dedit discipulis suis. Cesset ergo lac in sacrificando offerri, quia manifestum et evidens exemplum evangelicae veritatis illuxit quod praeter panem et vinum aliud offerri non sinit. Illud vero quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit; seorsum enim panis, et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum praebuisse non legimus, excepto illi tantum discipulo quem intincta buccella magistri proditorem ostenderet, non quae sacramenti hujus institutionem signaret. . . ." (Hard. iii. 1032, 1033.)

In the absence of any special statement to the contrary, this prohibition would doubtless be held to apply to clinical communions as well as to communion at the mass; yet, if it be rightly assigned to the First Council of Lestines (A.D. 743), a canon put forth in Belgium in the following century possibly prescribes the use of some sort of intinction where the invalid is unconscious.[1]

The liturgical sources of this age do not greatly help in our inquiry. The *Leonine* Sacramentary provides no form for the communion of the sick. In the *Gelasian* Sacramentary, edited by Wilson, and assigned by him to the seventh century or the early part of the eighth, there is contained a series of prayers which accompany the celebration of mass in a private house,[2] but there is no mention of

[1] "Is qui poenitentiam in infirmitate petit si casu dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit vel in phrenesim versus fuerit, dent testimonium qui eum audierant et accipiat poenitentiam. Et si continuo creditur moriturus reconcilietur per manus impositionem et *infundatur* ori eius eucharistia. . . ." (*P.L.* lxxxix. 823.) The date and source of this canon are most uncertain. Smend (*Kelchspendung u. Kelchversagung*, p. 20) marks it as doubtfully assigned to *Concil. Leptinense* (743). Hefele-Leclercq discusses the group in which it occurs without coming to any very definite conclusions (*Hist. des Conciles*, II. pt. 1, pp. 102 ff.), but inclines to the belief that the series was compiled in the diocese of Arles in the early part of the sixth century. The series (commonly cited as *Ecclesia Statuta Antiqua*) was formerly supposed to have been issued by a pretended council of Carthage in A.D. 398 (so in Hard. i. 983). The capitularies of Carolingian canonists and prelates contain extracts from this group of canons, *e.g.* Isaaci Lingonensis, *Canones.* 20 (*P.L.* cxxiv. 1081). Some writers, laying stress upon the expression *infundatur*, suppose that the use of the Wine alone is intended.

[2] See p. 27 above.

sickness made in them, nor is any formula of administration provided. Sickly infants are to be communicated immediately after baptism, apparently with the eucharistic Bread, but the language of the rubric is ambiguous.[1] As to the Gallican rites, the *Bobbio Sacramentary* gives a similar *missa in domo cuiuslibet*;[2] the texts of the others are imperfect. No doubt the very simplicity of the rite of administration of the reserved Eucharist may account for the fact that no special directions on this point are to be found in the early sacramentaries. It would only be necessary to use, with whatever modification was necessary, the formulae employed at the delivery of the elements at the public service; and these were assumed to be so familiar that documents of the period do not insert them even in the text of the Liturgy.[3]

Of some importance too is the frequent occurrence at this time of forms for hallowing the *chrismal*.[4] As this vessel is named among the ornaments of a church, it seems fair to maintain that a receptacle for use in official reservation is intended. From a comparison of the benediction of a *chrismal* in the *Missale Francorum*,[5] and the benediction of a *turris* in the *Missale Vesontionense*,[6] it appears that the two receptacles are equivalent, and that both were used in official reservation for some purpose or other, that may include the necessities of the sick.

From the numerous biographical notices of the period we derive again but little aid toward solving the problems which we have set ourselves to consider. The evidence at our disposal gives no warrant for any very definite assertions

[1] *Sacr. Gelas.* I. 75: "postea (*i.e.* after baptism) si fuerit oblata, agendae sunt missae, et communicat; sin autem, dabis ei tantum sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Christi, dicens: corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi sit tibi in vitam aeternam." (Wilson, p. 117.)

[2] See p. 30 above.

[3] The words of delivery were omitted from documents of a later period for another reason—namely, because communion of the people was very rare.

[4] *e.g.* in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*: ". . . ut per nostram benedictionem hoc vasculum sanctificetur et corporis Christi novum sepulchrum Spiritus Sancti gratia perficiatur." (Wilson, p. 136.) For other forms of benediction, see chap. xiv.

[5] *P.L.* lxxii. 330.

[6] This is Mabillon's *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*. (Neale and Forbes, *Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church*, p. 362.)

concerning the manner and form in which the sacrament was administered.

In the story of Cædmon's end the use of the Host alone is plainly implied, and we gather that it was customary to reserve the Eucharist in the hospital where he died. He conversed with the inmates of the hospital in a pleasant manner for some time, "until it was past midnight, and then he asked whether they had the Eucharist in the house. 'What need is there of the Eucharist?' they answered, 'for you are not likely to die: you talk as merrily as if you were in the best of health.' 'However,' he replied, 'bring me the Eucharist.' So he received it into his hand, and asked if they were all in charity with him. . . . 'Then, fortifying himself with the heavenly *viaticum*, he prepared to enter upon another life.'"[1]

It is rarely, however, that so detailed a picture is drawn as that which Bede has given us in his account of Cædmon's death. Most descriptions of clinical communion seem to presuppose the use of the reserved sacrament, but positive information as to the mode of administering it is exceedingly scanty. Mention of the two species is, indeed, frequent; but we possess no means of ascertaining the real value of such phrases—that is to say, how far expressions of this sort correspond with actual practice. Moreover, where there is reason to believe that both the Bread and the Wine were actually employed, we are still left to surmise in what form they were administered, whether conjointly or separately. A few instances will suffice to illustrate these remarks.

We meet, of course, with the term *viaticum* (with or without further specification) scattered through the literature of the time; as, for example, in the story of St. Hild, who according to Bede received after midnight, "the *viaticum* of the most holy communion."[2]

[1] Baedae *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 22 (24). "Cum jam mediae noctis tempus esset transcensum, interrogavit si eucharistiam intus haberent. Respondebant: 'Quid opus est eucharistia? neque enim mori adhuc habes, qui tam hilariter nobiscum velut sospes loqueris.' Rursus ille: 'Et tamen, ait, afferte mihi eucharistiam.' Qua accepta in manu, interrogavit si omnes placidum erga se animum, et sine querela controversiae ac rancoris haberent." (Plummer, *Baedae Opera Hist.* i. p. 261.)

[2] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 21 (23). "Septimo ergo suae infirmitatis anno, converso ad interanea dolore, ad diem pervenit ultimum, et circa galli cantum,

Bede often uses the expression, "the Body and Blood of the Lord." He tells of St. Cuthbert that he was asked to send a priest with the "*corporis et sanguinis dominici sacramenta*" to the dying wife of an official at the court of King Egfrid;[1] and, when the saint's own end was upon him, he also received the Body and Blood.[2]

In language similar to this the same author describes the last communion of St. Chad[3] and of Benedict Biscop.[4]

The use of the two species seems to be implied again in the Life of St. Eloy of Noyon († A.D. 659),[5] which was compiled by his contemporary, St. Ouen; and in the biographies of St. Ansbert of Rouen († A.D. 695),[6] of St. Vaast of Arras († A.D. 540),[7] and in the

percepto viatico sacrosanctae communionis . . . de morte transivit ad vitam." Plummer, *Baedae Opera Hist.* i. p. 256.

It seems unnecessary to give many instances of the use of the term *viaticum* at this period: cf. Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, etc., ii. 25 (Krusch, *Passiones*, iv. p. 151); *Vita S. Eremberti Tolosan. ep.* (Boll. *AA.SS.*, May 14th); *Vita Betharii ep. Carnoten* († *c.* A.D. 623), 16 (Krusch, *op. cit.* iii. 619).

[1] *Vita S. Cudbercti*, 15. "obsecro, quia uxor mea male habet et videtur jam proxima morti, ut mittas presbyterum qui illam priusquam moriatur visitet, eique corporis et sanguinis dominici sacramenta ministret; sed et corpus ipsius hic locis sanctis sepeliri permittas." (Stevenson, *Baedae Opera Hist.* ii. p. 77.) Her husband was ashamed to say that she was out of her mind, but St. Cuthbert diagnosed her case as a visitation of the devil and went himself to see her.

[2] *ibid.* 39. "exitum suum, quem jam venisse cognovit, dominici corporis et sanguinis communione munivit." (Stevenson, *op. cit.* ii. p. 125.)

[3] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 3. "postquam obitum suum dominici corporis et sanguinis perceptione munivit." (Plummer, *op. cit.* i. p. 210.)

[4] *Hist. Abbat.* ii. 14. "dominici corporis et sanguinis sacramentum hora exitus instante pro viatico datur." (Plummer, *op. cit.* i. p. 378.)

[5] bk. ii. 16. "praeterea quotiens aliqua infirmitas supervenerit, non quaerantur praecantatores, non divini, non sortilogi, non caragi, nec per fontes aut arbores vel bivios diabolica filacteria exerceantur; sed qui aegrotat, in sola dei misericordia confidat et eucharistiam corporis ac sanguinis Christi cum fide et devotione accipiat oleumque benedictum fideliter ab ecclesia petat, unde corpus suum in nomine Christi ungeat, et secundum apostolum oratio fidei salvabit infirmum. . . ." (Krusch, *Passiones*, iv. p. 707.) Practically a quotation from the sermons attributed to St. Caesarius of Arles (see p. 113).

[6] c. 9. "perceptione corporis et sanguinis domini se muniens." (*Analecta Boll.* i. p. 189.)

[7] *Vita Vedasti Episc. Atrebatensis.* ii. 9. "sacrosancto corporis et sanguinis Christi confirmatus viatico." (Krusch, *op. cit.* iii. p. 423.) This

eighth-century Life of St. Vincentian,[1] and elsewhere besides.

How was the invalid actually communicated in these cases? Doubtless, as most of these people died in monasteries, we may believe that, in some instances at least, they were houselled directly from the altar, either during or immediately after one of the regular masses, or from one that was celebrated for the express purpose of providing *viaticum*. Such expedients, as we have already noticed, were not unusual in religious houses.

Bede's story of the child who died in the monastery at Selsey is a case in point. It has already been mentioned in another place; but here we may remark, first, that there was no use of the reserved sacrament on this occasion, and secondly, that whereas the child is bidden in his vision to ask for "*viaticum* of the Lord's Body and Blood," the abbot is represented as sending to him from the mass in the monastic church a "fragment (*particulam*) of the Lord's oblation."[2] It is hazardous to use these two phrases, as some have done, in argument for the prevalence at this period of conjoint administration of the two species. "*viaticum dominici corporis et sanguinis*" and similar expressions are probably only common phrases of the time, meaning merely the last communion, without reference to the form in which it was given.

If we turn to the pages of Jonas of Bobbio, who wrote the Lives of St. Columban and the early abbots of Bobbio, we find that he constantly uses language which implies the use of the Host alone as *viaticum*. A typical passage is to be found, *e.g.* in his story of the death of another Columban, a companion of the saint who bore the name, where he relates that the dying man received as *viaticum*

occurs in the earlier stratum of the text, which may date from the seventh century.

[1] *Vita*, auctore pseudo-Heremberto (? 712–715): "eucharistiam corporis ac sanguinis domini Jesu Christi ei tradidit." (Krusch and Levison, *Passiones*, v. p. 123.)

[2] See p. 21. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 14. "viatico dominici corporis ac sanguinis accepto, sic infirmitate simul et morte absolutus, ad aeterna in caelis gaudia subleveris." "simul et infirmanti puero de eodem sacrificio dominicae oblationis particulam deferri mandavit." (Plummer, *op. cit.* i. pp. 234, 235.)

the Body of Christ.[1] And once more, in reference to the last communion of a monk named Agibodus, he makes mention only of the one element.[2] Other examples from this writer, showing his frequent use of similar phrases, are subjoined below.[3] The impression left by the perusal of these passages is that Jonas was probably familiar with the form of clinical communion in which the Bread only was employed; and we might adduce in support of this conclusion that passage in the additions to the rule drawn up by its founder for the monastery at Bobbio, wherein participation in the chalice at any time seems to be forbidden to uninstructed novices.[4]

[1] *Vitae Columbani abbat. discipulorumque* i. 17. "corpus christi abeunti de hac vita viaticum praebet." (Krusch, *Passiones*, iv. p. 85.)

[2] *op. cit.* ii. 25. "cumque sacrum corpus domini sumpserit. . . ." (Krusch, *op. cit.* iv. p. 151.)

[3] ii. 13. "cumque objurgata a praefata matre fuisset ut admissae noxae culpam lueret, et quoadusque poenitentiae interdictae normam implesset, se a corpore domini privaret, cumque illa sacri corporis privatione interdictu audisset," etc. (Krusch, *op. cit.* p. 133.) "ut a corpore Christi sua culpa segregaretur." (*ibid.*) "et in hac die reconciliare corpore Christi." (*ibid.*)

ii. 19. "tanti doloris atque meroris eventu mater urguet, ut per confessionem pandantur vitia et sacri corporis communione roborentur. At illae, audita sacri corporis mentione, garrire dentibus ac frendere coeperunt et stridentes dicere: 'cras, cras,' et interim supradictam vocem repetere: 'expectate, expectate, sustinete paululum, sustinete,'" etc. (Krusch, *op. cit.* p. 140.)

ii. 10. "viaticoque sumpto, animam caelo reddidit." (Krusch, *op. cit.* p. 129.)

ii. 25. "tantum viaticum capere et valedicere fratribus." (Krusch, *op. cit.* p. 150.)

ibid. "viaticum poposcit."

ii. 16. "quadam etenim die dominico cum missarum sollemnia saepefata Burgundofara cum famularum dei collegio expectaret et jam sacri corporis communione participarentur, quaedam ex his nomine domina, cum jam corpus domini accepisset ac sanguinem libasset, et sacro choro inserta, cum comparibus caneret: hoc sacrum corpus domini et salvatoris sanguinem sumite vobis in vitam perennem," etc. (Krusch, *op. cit.* p. 135.) This was at mass in church.

The Life of St. John, abbot of Réomée († A.D. 540), which is probably of Jonas' authorship, contains the passages: "per multa spacia temporum nec panis alimenta nec sacri corporis sacramenta capere possit" and "quamquam corporis ore eucharistie sacramento non accepisses." (Krusch, *op. cit.* iii. p. 511.)

[4] c. 10. "Et novi, quia indocti, et quicumque fuerint tales, ad calicem non accedant; et quando offertur oblatio, nullus cogatur coactus accipere sacrificium, praeter necessitatem." (*P.L.* lxxx. 220.) This regulation does not necessarily exclude the use of intincted Hosts: cf. the instructions in Udalric's version of the "*Antiquiores Consuetudines*" of Cluny (D'Achery, *Spicilegium* i. p. 678): "Debent autem singuli ita se scutellae adjungere, ut si forte inter sumendum corpus domini aliquando vel de ore sumentis vel de manu porrigentis lapsum fuerit, nisi in scutellam cadere non possit. Quotquot autem ipsum corpus sacrum dederit, singulis sanguine prius intinguit." Another codex, says D'Achery, adds the note: "Quamquam sit contra usum aliarum ecclesiarum, quia quidam maxime novitii nostri adeo sunt rudes, ut si sanguinem ita separatim acciperent non remaneret ut non magnam aliquando negligentiam incurrerent." (*ibid.*)

We may therefore sum up the two centuries, *c.* A.D. 600–800, by saying that the sacrament was officially reserved for the needs of sick and dying: that, in some places, at least, the ancient method of extra-liturgical communion in the one species of Bread persisted, although it is likely that wherever intinction was favourably regarded by diocesan or other authority this practice might affect the mode in which the Eucharist was reserved and administered.

THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES

(*b*) The second division of our present period opens with the story of Charlemagne's reforms in Church and State. Of all the ecclesiastical reforms made at this period none were more important than the revision of the Church's service-books which led to the adoption of the so-called Gregorian Sacramentary in preference to any of the rites, Roman or Gallican, previously in use.

Between the years A.D. 784 and A.D. 791 Pope Hadrian sent to Charlemagne the famous document that has had so permanent an influence upon all subsequent liturgical developments in the West.

But those who were charged with the revision and reform of the service-books were not content to accept this new sacramentary in its original condition. Where it seemed to lack, they supplied the deficiency from material contained in the local rites. Thus it came about that there was almost immediately associated with copies of the "Gregorian" sacramentary a varying amount of material from Gallican and from other Roman sources.

Among the things which Adrian's original lacked appears to have been an office for clinical communion.

The Carolingian ritualists, therefore, inserted services for the sick and dying from rites with which they were already familiar; possibly from the revised Gelasian books which preceded the use of the "Gregorian" sacramentaries.

One of the earliest examples of these mixed sacramentaries was that of St. Remi of Reims, if (as was claimed) it was written in the last few years of the eighth century.[1] It is unfortunately no longer in existence, for it perished by fire when the Abbey Library was burnt out in 1774. Ménard, however, before this date had examined it, and printed in his edition of the *Gregorianum* the *ordo ad visitandum infirmum* provided in the manuscript.[2]

It contains many points of interest. In the first place it presents a very early example of a set of rubrical directions which hereafter occur with great frequency in early mediaeval orders for the communion of the sick.

After instructions for unction and reconciliation there follows: "Let him (*i.e.* the officiant) communicate the sick person, saying: 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thee to life eternal. The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ redeem thee to life eternal. The peace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the communion of the saints be with thee and with us to eternal life. Amen.'"[3] Then comes a prayer, and subjoined to it is this rubric: "And for seven days, or if need be for longer, the patient shall be anointed and houselled; as the Apostle, or rather the Holy Ghost speaking through him, directs: *si in peccatis fuerit, dimittentur ei.* Moreover the ministers of holy Church are to take care that the daily offices be said in his presence—that is to say, Mattins, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, and Compline. And if the bishop be present, he shall give a blessing; if not, the priests present shall say one of the following prayers apiece."[4] Here

[1] Probably between A.D. 798–800. (Delisle, *Mémoires sur d'anciens sacramentaires*, 1886.) See also Wilson, *Gregorian Sacramentary* (H.B.S.), p. 206.

[2] Printed in *P.L.* lxxviii. 529 ff. See below, pp. 240–244.

[3] "*communicet infirmum tunc dicens*: corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam. Sanguis domini nostri Jesu Christi redimat te in vitam aeternam. Pax domini nostri Jesu Christi et sanctorum communio sit tecum et nobiscum in vitam aeternam." (*ibid.*)

[4] "et septem dies vel multo plures, si necessitas fuerit, tam de communione quam de alio officio erga infirmum fiat; sicut apostolus dicit, immo per eum Spiritus Sanctus ait: *Si in peccatis fuerit, dimittentur ei.* Debent etiam ex ministris sanctae ecclesiae procurare in (*leg.* ut) canonici cursus circa eum decantentur; id est matutinae, prima, tertia, sexta, nona, vesperum, completorium. Quod si episcopus adfuerit, benedictionem dabit; si non, singuli sacerdotes singulas has orationes dicant."

With certain modifications, this type of rubric, ordering in case of need a daily repetition of unction and communion (generally for the space of a week), and the recitation of the choir offices in the church, is to be found in many codices of the ninth and following centuries.

Two of the best known are the ninth-century *Codex Rodradi* (*P.L.* lxxviii. 522), and the tenth-century *Codex Ratoldi* (*P.L.* lxxviii. 524 ff.).

Several *ordines* associated with the diocese of Tours and elsewhere in France, dating from the end of the ninth or from the tenth century, are printed by Martène (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii, art. 4, pp. 301 ff.).

The dates of the documents referred to in this section are generally taken from Delisle. See also the newly-published *Sacramentary of Fulda*, Richter and Schönfelder (1912), p. 297.

Theodulf of Orleans († A.D. 829) alludes to directions of this sort in his capitular: "Uncto vero infirmo cum orationibus, ut dictum est, jubeatur a sacerdote orationem dominicam et symbolum dicere, et spiritum suum in manus dei commendare, et signaculo crucis se munire et viventibus valedicere. Tunc sacerdos det ei pacem et communicet eum dicens: *corpus et sanguis domini sit tibi remissio omnium peccatorum tuorum, et custodiat te in vitam aeternam.* Tunc data oratione in fine dicat sacerdos, benedicamus domino: et respondeant omnes, deo gratias, et expletum est. In crastino et usque ad septem dies visitet eum sacerdos et fundat super eum orationes ad hoc congruentes." (*P.L.* cv. 222.)

the words of delivery suggest the separate administration of both species.

But if the sick man is very weak and near to death, the whole rite of unction, of reconciliation, and of communion, is reduced to a minimum, and another formula of administration is provided. "The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve (*custodiat*) thy soul to eternal life."[1] It is noteworthy that, in contrast with the words of administration prescribed in the former office, the two words *corpus* and *sanguis* are here joined together, and grammatically form the subject of a singular verb (*custodiat*). It would be too much to assert that this must necessarily mean that the Bread and Wine are given conjointly, but in view of the circumstances for which this rubric provides

[1] "cum vero ingravari coeperit, ad succurrendum, facta aqua benedicta dicatur oratio haec: domine, sancte pater omnipotens," etc. "tunc unguatur oleo. Unguo te de oleo sanctificato," etc. Collect, "concede, domine, nobis famulis tuis," etc. "communicet dicens: corpus et sanguis domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam. Amen." (*P.L.* lxxviii. 539.)

that seems to be a reasonable conclusion.[1] For the difficulty in swallowing so often experienced by the dying would be obviated by the use of a Host dipped into the contents of the chalice immediately before delivery.

If the use of intinction is intended, the language of the rubric itself gives us no information as to which variety of the practice shall be used. The use of a reserved Host previously intincted, and used for hallowing an unconsecrated draught, would suit the conditions indicated and be in keeping with the custom of the time. This form of words of delivery, with unimportant variations, is characteristic of a great number of the "Gregorian" sacramentaries.[2]

The constant supply of the reserved Eucharist appears to be definitely ordered for the first time in the *Capitula Ecclesiastica* issued by a council that met at Aix-la-Chapelle somewhere between A.D. 810–813, wherein it was enacted, "That the priest shall always keep the sacrament in readiness, so that if any one be overtaken by sickness or a child should be ill, he may give them communion immediately, and none may die unhouselled."[3]

This injunction reappeared in language almost or quite identical in such documents as the diocesan capitularies of several prelates of this age; for example, in those of Rudolph of Bourges († A.D. 866)[4] and of Walter of Orleans († A.D. 891);[5] and it was included by Ansegisus, abbot of Fontanelle († A.D. 833),[6] and by Regino, abbot of Prüm († A.D. 915),[7] in their collections of canons. In the absence of evidence to the contrary we should be compelled to

[1] So Ménard himself, *u.s.* 555 f.

Argument from the mere verbal form is at a later date most fallacious, and it is doubtful whether we may make use of it here.

[2] See the collection in Martène, *op. cit.*

[3] *Can.* 16: "Ut presbyter semper eucharistiam habeat paratam, ut quando quis infirmaverit aut parvulus infirmus fuerit, statim eum communicet, ne sine communione moriatur." (*Capitularia Reg. Franc.* I, p. 179, in *Monumenta German. Hist.*) "*Parvulus*" might be used of children generally, or of infants. Here it seems to mean children who were unconfirmed, and about whose case a priest might have doubt. Confirmation was becoming detached from baptism in the West.

[4] *cap.* 6. *P.L.* cxix. 706.

[5] *cap.* 7. Hard. v. 461.

[6] Bk. I. c. 155. (*Capitularia. Reg. Franc.* I. p. 412.)

[7] Bk. I. *Notitiae.* c. 70. (*P.L.* cxxxii. 205.)

believe that reservation of the single species was intended.[1]

It is during the ninth century, too, that we begin to meet with inquiries, made on episcopal or archidiaconal visitations, as to whether the parish priest provides the reserved sacrament for the communion of the sick, and whether he keeps it in a suitable vessel. Bishop Hincmar of Reims († A.D. 858) used to ask on these occasions "Whether he (the priest) has a pyx wherein the sacred oblation may be decently reserved for the *viaticum* of the sick."[2] A similar inquiry leaves it doubtful whether the pyx was constantly to be kept above the altar or to be suspended over it.[3]

The regular renewal of the reserved Eucharist is often dealt with. Ecclesiastical authorities appoint a definite term, sometimes of three, more often of seven, occasionally of fourteen days, at the conclusion of which the Host in the pyx was to be consumed and a newly-consecrated one to be put in its place. Penances of varying degrees of severity are allotted in the penitentials for failure to observe these requirements.[4]

But by far the most interesting injunction of the period is a canon of uncertain date and origin preserved by Regino of Prüm.

"Let every priest have a pyx or other vessel worthy of so great a sacrament, in which the Body of the Lord may be carefully stored for the *viaticum* of those who leave this world. And this sacred oblation ought to be intincted in the Blood of Christ, in order that the priest may be able to

[1] Very similar are the instructions set forth in the composite capitular which bears the name of Archbishop Egbert of York († 766): *Cap.* 22. "ut presbyter eucharistiam habeat semper paratam ad infirmos ne sine communione moriantur." *Cap.* 20. "ut cuncti sacerdotes . . . omnibus infirmis ante exitum vitae viaticum et communionem corporis Christi misericorditer tribuant." (Hard. iii. 1963.) Both canons belong to portions of the document posterior to Egbert. The former is derived ultimately from Carolingian sources; the latter comes from an even later period.

[2] *Capitul.* ii. 8. ". . . si habeat pyxidem ubi congrue possit recondi sacra oblatio reservanda ad viaticum infirmis?" (Hard. v. 395.)

[3] Regino, *Notitiae.* i. 9. "Inquirendum si pixida semper sit super altare cum sacra oblatione ad viaticum infirmis." See chap. xii.

[4] See chap. xi.

say with truth, 'The Body and Blood of the Lord avail thee.' And let it always be kept locked up on (or above ?) the altar, on account of mice or wicked men; and let it be changed every third day; that is to say, the reserved Host shall be consumed by the priest, and another, consecrated on the same day, shall be substituted for it, lest by being kept too long it become mouldy, which God forbid." [1]

This is the one definite statement that we have as to the use at this period of an intincted Host for reservation; and it seems to explain much that would otherwise be ambiguous, including the often incomplete and abrupt directions in many orders for the visitation of the sick.[2]

[1] *Notitiae* I. 70. "Ut omnis presbyter habeat pixidem aut vas tanto sacramento dignum ubi corpus dominicum diligenter recondatur ad viaticum recedentibus a seculo. Quae sacra oblatio intincta debet esse in sanguine Christi ut veraciter presbyter possit dicere infirmo, corpus et sanguis domini proficiat tibi; semperque sit super altare obseratum propter mures et nefarios homines, et de tertio in tertium diem semper mutetur, i.e. illa a presbytero sumatur, et alia, quae eodem die consecrata est, in locum subrogetur, ne forte diutius reservata, mucida, quod absit, fiat." (*P.L.* cxxxii. 205.)

Cited also by Burchard († 1025), *Decret.* V. 9. And Ivo of Chartres (1092), *Decret.* II. 19 (*P.L.* clxi. 165), and ascribed by both to a Council of Tours.

[2] *e.g.* in the fragment attributed by Regino to Bede (of uncertain origin, but of no later date than the ninth century): "postquam infirmus sacra unctione fuerit delibutus, statim corpore et sanguine domini recreandus est," to which is added a quotation of *St. John* vi. 54, 55. An ordo of Tours in Martène's collection (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii, art 4, ordo 6) has simply the direction, "deinde communica eum"; another, of Reims (*u.s.* ordo 10) has, "hic communica eum," but the prayer that follows names the two species, "domine sancte, pater omnipotens, aeterne deus, te fideliter deprecemur ut accipienti fratri nostro (*vel* sorore nostrae) sacrosanctum corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi filii tui domini nostri, tam corporis quam animae sit salus. Per eundem."

This prayer is to be found in other sacramentaries of the same type. It reappears, slightly modified, in the *Stowe Missal*, where it is used immediately before the act of communicating. See below, p. 245. Generally, when the rubrics omit all mention of the elements, the formulae employed in administration, or some prayer closely associated with the delivery of the sacred species, supply the deficiency.

In his notes on the "Gregorian" sacramentary, Ménard transcribes part of a "*Manuale Ecclesiae Suessoniensis*," in which it is supposed that the invalid will not necessarily make his communion: "postea communicet eum his verbis, si communicare infirmus voluerit; sin autem, praetermissis his quatuor orationibus, quae sequuntur, dicat istas duas: benedicat te deus, etc. Propitietur dominus. Corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi

The prohibition of intinction by the Council of Braga was evidently transitory and local in its effect, and probably had no immediate influence upon the practice of the Church in Gaul and elsewhere. By the tenth century intinction had come to be a common way in which communion was given to the people at the mass.[1] The injunction quoted above shows that the sacrament was also prepared in a conjoint form of reservation, and in this form was spoken of as the *corpus dominicum* as well as in terms that express the presence of both elements.

It is thus that we may explain the rubric contained in the order for communion of the sick in the *Leofric Missal.* The order is part of the original tenth-century sacramentary that forms the bulk of the missal, and the rubric contains elements of the usual "Gregorian" sort, ordering the recitation of the daily offices on behalf of the sick person. But the minister of *viaticum* is bidden to dip the Host in wine *or* water, and to say as he does so, or as he communicates the invalid with the saturated sacrament: "May the commixture and consecration of the Body and Blood of

conservet animam in vitam aeternam." The directions are rather confused. (*P.L.* lxxviii. 542.) Note the phrase "*corpus domini*": "*communio corporis*" appears in Ménard's text of the sacramentary of St. Remi. (*P.L.* lxxviii. 539.)

[1] The simple primitive customs of placing the consecrated Bread in the naked palm, and of administering the chalice directly to the lips of the communicant were modified in the West, first, by the introduction of the *dominicale*, in the case of women (if this name is rightly applied to the linen cloth or napkin prescribed at Auxerre, A.D. 578. can. 36 and 42); and later, *i.e.* at some time in the eighth century, by the use of the reed or pipe (*pugillaris calamus fistula*, etc.) in connection with the ministerial chalice. Although the reed was commonly employed so long as the laity were permitted to communicate from the chalice, and continued in use among ecclesiastics, the Host was, as a rule, placed in the mouth of the lay-communicant during and after the ninth century at Rome and elsewhere. The subdeacon is communicated thus in Ordo Rom. vi (Mabill. *Mus. Ital.* ii. p. 75). The local adoption of intinction and its increasing prevalence in the West led in time to the usage, which seems to have been fairly general in the tenth century, viz. that the clergy above the rank of subdeacon receive the two kinds separately, while the subdeacon and people receive the *eucharistia intincta*.

This is the custom described in the *Codex Ratoldi* of the Benedictine Abbey of Corbie. "Et episcopus communicet presbyteros et diaconos cum osculo pacis, *sicco* tamen sacrificio: et subdiaconos *mixto* sacrificio." (Ménard, *Gregorian Sacrament: P.L.* lxxviii. 265.)

our Lord Jesus Christ be to us and to all who receive for the remission of all sins and for eternal life."[1]

We may suppose that the Host which is intended for use has been previously prepared in the way prescribed by Regino's canon, and that the immersion in wine or water is to facilitate the swallowing of the sacrament.

Still another method of preparing and storing intincted Hosts for *viaticum* is suggested elsewhere. Instead of a pyx, a chalice seems to have been used sometimes for the purpose of reserving the conjoint species. We are told, in the ninth-century Life of the Alsatian Abbess Odilia († A.D. 720) that her companions feared that she had died unhouselled, and that she was restored to life in answer to their prayers. Then she asked for the chalice wherein the sacrament—"the Body and Blood of the Lord"—was kept, and so made her communion.[2] There is no hint in the narrative that she sent at mass time for the Eucharist, and the natural sense of the passage is that the sacrament was reserved conjointly in both kinds in a chalice.

Here brief note may be taken of the Celtic Orders, collected by Warren,[3] since it seems safe to place them all within the limits of the period. According to Duchesne they are essentially Roman in origin, that is to say "Gregorian," with varying admixture of Gallican details. The form prescribed in the "*Stowe Missal*" closely resembles

[1] "hic communicetur infirmus, et ponat sacrificium in vino sive aqua, dicens: fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Ihesu Christi nobis et omnibus accipientibus in remissionem omnium peccatorum et vitam aeternam. Amen." (Warren, *Leofric Missal*, p. 241.) Maskell (*Mon. Ritual.* I. p. 111) reads *sine* for *sive*; and if this were the true reading we should be concerned with an instance of consecration *e contactu hostiae*. The use of the phrase "*fiat . . . consecratio*" would appear to support this interpretation. But the insistence upon the use of wine unmixed with water for such a purpose would need explanation. (See Warren, *op. cit.* lxiv.) With the use of the phrase "*fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis*," etc., cf. "*haec communicatio et consecratio*" in the commixture at the mass.

[2] *Vita* 22. "illae autem e contra ferebant se hoc idcirco egisse ne negligentia notarentur, si ipsa expers dominici corporis exiret. Cumque calicem in quo dominicum corpus et sanguis habebatur, sibi afferri iussisset, propriis manibus eum accipiendo, sancta communione participata, omnibus cernentibus, animam tradidit. Ipse autem calix in eodem monasterio ob memoriam illius venerabilis facti actenus permanet." (Krusch, *Passiones*, vi. p. 50.)

[3] *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, pp. 163–173, 223–225.

those that are found in the early group of mixed sacramentaries represented by that of Noyon.[1] The fragment preserved in the Book of Deer has a vernacular rubric, "*Hisund dubar sacorfaicc dau*," *i.e.* "Here give him the sacrifice."[2] In these and in the fragments written in the Books of Moling[3] and of Dimma[4] mention is made of the two species, either in the words of delivery or in prayers associated with the act of communion. The order in the Book of Moling uses the formula, "The Body *with* the Blood of our Lord," etc., and all seem to assume the use of the sacrament conjointly administered. It seems highly probable too that it was reserved in an intincted state.[5]

Hitherto we have followed in this section the evidence

[1] The rite follows the rite for unction, and opens with the prayer: "oramus te, domine, pro fratre nostro N. cui infirmitate sua officium communionis, ut si qua eum saecularis macula invassit aut vitium mondialem ficit, dono tuae pietatis indulgeas et extergas. Per." Next, "domine, sancte pater, te fidiliter deprecemur ut accipiendi fratri nostro sacrosanctam hanc æucharistiam corporis et sanguinis domini nostri ihesu christi tam carnis quam animae sit salus. per dominum." "Exaudi nos, domine ihesu christe, deus noster, pro fratre nostro infirmo te rogantes ut tua sancta euchoristia sit ei tutella. per dominum." "Pax et caritas domini nostri ihesu christi et commonicatio sanctorum tuorum sit semper nobiscum. ℟. Amen." "Corpus et sanguis domini nostri Ihesu Christi filii dei vivi altissimi rel." (*H.B.S.* xxxii. 35.)

There follows a responsorial form of thanksgiving, as in the other Celtic orders. (*H.B.S.* xxxii. *ibid.* Warren, *op. cit.* pp. 223, 224.)

[2] Warren, *op cit.* p. 164. After the rubric are the words of delivery: "corpus cum sangine domini nostri Ihesu Christi sanitas sit tibi in vitam perpetua[m] et salutem."

[3] "*tum reficitur corpore et sanguine.* Corpus cum sanguine domini nostri Ihesu Christi sanctus sit tibi in vitam eternam." (Warren, *op. cit.* p. 173.)

[4] "*hic pax datur ei et dicis*, pax et commonicatio (sic) sanctorum tuorum, Christe Ihesu, sit semper nobiscum. *Respondit*, Amen.

"*das ei euchari[s]tiam dicens*, corpus et sanguis domini nostri Ihesu Christi filii dei uiui conseruat animam tuam in uitam perpetuam." (Warren, *op. cit.* p. 170.) Warren (p. 224, n. 3) draws attention to the blending of the pax and "communicatio" (this latter in a different sense) in the German rite printed by Gerbert, *Lit. Aleman.* ii. 33: "pax et communicatio corporis et sanguinis domini," etc. cf. also the Salzburg Pontifical (eleventh century) in Martène (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii, art 4, ordo 15), where the same formula occurs.

[5] See Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 96. A later (twelfth-century) document of Celtic provenance uses similar language of the sacrament in communion of the sick at the beginning of an incomplete order, "ad communicandum infirmum." (Warren, *Missale vetus Hibernicum*, p. 209.)

provided mainly by ecclesiastical legislation and liturgical documents. For the purpose of illustrating these injunctions and directions we may select from the abundant historical and biographical sources of the period a few instances in which allusion is made to *viaticum*. The fidelity with which the rubrics found in sacramentaries of the St. Remi type were carried out in practice is seen in the story of how St. Rembert of Hamburg († A.D. 888) was prepared for his end. A contemporary but unknown hand has preserved his history. "On the seventh day preceding his death they began to administer to him the unction with holy oil, and also the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord; until the day of his soul's departure from the body he daily received this salutary remedy."[1]

More often the narratives are less detailed, but mention of two species is frequent. For example, St. Peter Urseolus († *c.* A.D. 997), who had once been Duke of Venice and Dalmatia, but spent his later years in the monastery of St. Michael, at Coxano in Catalania, made his last communion thus: "Knowing beforehand the time of his departure, he called the brethren with the father (*i.e.* the abbot) of the monastery, and said good-bye to them, and gave them the kiss of peace. Then he received the Body and Blood of the Lord, and blessing and absolution (*absolutio viatica*), and was laid in ashes and sackcloth" to await the end.[2] This one instance must serve as a specimen of many similar passages.[3] Again, reference is made to both species

[1] *Vita S. Remberti*, c. 23. "Septimo ante obitum die ministerium sacrae unctionis cum oleo sancto ei fieri coepit, et una cum communione corporis et sanguinis domini usque in diem animae exeuntis de corpore hoc salutare remedium omni die percepit. Et cum jam migraturus esset de mundo, convocatis presbyteris et universis fratribus, veniam petivit de omnibus quaecunque fortassis in aliquem illorum peccasset. Et cum ipse vicissim reconciliationem fecisset omnibus Christianis, a quocunque in eum aliquid commissum fuisset, veniamque eis a domino poposcisset, percepto corpore et sanguine domini sacram animam emisit." (*P.L.* cxxvi. 1008.)

[2] *Vita*, c. 18. ". . . advocat fratres cum patre monasterii, eisque pacem tribuendo valedicens, corpore et sanguine domini assumto et benedictione et absolutione viatica assumta in cinere et cilicio jacens. . . ." (Mabill. *AA.SS. o.s.B. saec. V.* p. 888.)

[3] *e.g.* in the redaction of the *Life of St. Corbinianus* († *c.* A.D. 730), edited in the ninth or tenth century, where the phrase "post perceptionem corporis et sanguinis Christi" replaces "post tanti Christi perceptione corporis" in the original document written by Arbeo, or Aribeo († A.D. 783). (Krusch, *Passiones*, vi. pp. 588, 627.)

The *Life of St. Riquier* († *c.* A.D. 645), written by Alcuin: "et dum salutifero corporis Christi et sanguinis viatico suum iter munivit." (Krusch, *op. cit.* iv. p. 398.)

in a canon issued by the ninth-century Synod of Pavia (Regia Ticina), which laid down that penitents under public discipline were not to receive unction unless they had been granted reconciliation, and so were fit to receive the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.[1]

In many biographies, such as that of Charlemagne, the accounts of the passing are very meagre; it is merely stated that the dying were accorded unction and *viaticum*.[2] More interesting, perhaps, are some scattered passages which seem to imply the use of the one species of bread.

The capitular of Isaac, bishop of Langres († A.D. 880), contains a reference to the "*sacrosanctum corpus*," without any mention of the other species. "If any one be overtaken by sickness, let him not end his life without communion, nor let him lack unction with the sacred oil: rather, when he sees death approach, his soul shall be commended to God by the priest, with prayers and the most holy Body."[3]

So again the ninth-century author of the *Life of St. Walfrid* († A.D. 765) says that the saint kissed the brethren one by one and blessed them; and then bade the Body of the Lord be brought, and so made his communion.[4] Such expressions may refer to the use of intincted Hosts, for in the canon quoted by Regino, "*corpus dominicum*" is used for the sacrament in conjoint form. But the same

[1] *Can.* 8. "Hoc tamen sciendum, quia si is qui infirmatur poenitentiae publicae mancipatus est, non potest hujus mysterii [*i.e.* unctionis] consequi medicinam, nisi prius reconciliatione percepta communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi meruerit. . . ." (Hard. v. 27.)

[2] *Vita*: "oleo autem sancto inunctus ab episcopis et viatico sumpto et omnibus suis dispositis commendans domino spiritum suum obiit in pace." (*P.L.* lxxviii. 522.)

[3] *Cap.* I. 23. "Si in infirmitate deprehensus quis fuerit, vitam sine communione non finiat nec unctione sacrati olei careat: et si finem perspiciat, sacrosancto corpore deo anima ejus a sacerdote precibus commendetur." (*P.L.* cxxiv. 1082.)

[4] *Cap.* ii. 8. "fratres singillatim exosculans benedicens, jussit sibi corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi afferri, quo accepto," etc. (*AA.SS.*, February 15th.)

canon suggests (by insisting upon the correspondence of actual practice with the formula employed) that the words, "*The Body and Blood of our Lord avail thee*," were sometimes used to accompany the delivery of a non-intincted Host.[1] This is important. For unless the allusion is to mere disregard of existing practice on the part of individual priests,[2] the canon seems to be aimed against the perpetuation of

[1] The formulae of delivery in clinical communion would follow the same lines of development as those which were employed in the public administration of the sacrament. The simple statements, σῶμα χριστοῦ . . . αἷμα χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς, to which the communicant replies, Ἀμήν, are given in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 13). Similarly, "corpus Christi," "sanguis Christi" are noted in the (?) fifth-century work, *De sacramentis* (iv. 21), formerly attributed to St. Ambrose. "dicit tibi sacerdos, 'corpus Christi,' et tu dicis 'Amen,' hoc est, verum" (*P.L.* xvi. 445). cf. the instructions given by St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* v. 18): "καὶ κοιλάνας τὴν παλάμην δέχου τὸ σῶμα τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἐπιλέγων τὸ Ἀμήν. . . . Εἶτα, μετὰ τὸ κοινωνῆσαί σε τοῦ σώματος χριστοῦ, προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ αἵματος· μὴ ἀνατείνων τὰς χεῖρας ἀλλὰ κύπτων καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν" (*P.G.* xxxiii. 1124). In these *Amen* is the reply to whatever words of delivery were used, and means, as above, "*ita est*." See Cornelii Papae *ep. ix ad Fabium* 8, in Euseb.: *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 43. § 19.

The next stage of development is the addition of such expressions as "*prosit tibi*," "*proficiat tibi*," "*custodiat te*," and similar phrases. The *Amen* that follows as a response bears the sense of "*fiat*." Further elaboration leads to such a form as "corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi prosit tibi in remissionem omnium peccatorum et vitam aeternam," which is the form given in Paul the Deacon's (eighth century) *Life of St. Gregory the Great*, *c.* 23 (*P.L.* lxxv. 52). In the same narrative, as told by John the Deacon (ninth century), Lib. ii. 41, the formula is: "corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi conservet animam tuam." (*P.L. op. cit.* 103.)

"*Perceptio corporis et sanguinis*," etc., "*communio corporis et sanguinis*," possibly used originally with conjoint administration are common.

For the long-continued variety and instability of these formulae "*Micrologus*," *i.e.* Bernold of Constance is witness, in the eleventh century: "orationem quam inclinari dicimus antequam communicemus non ex religiosorum traditione habemus, scilicet hanc: domine Jesu Christe, qui ex voluntate patris. Item et illud: corpus et sanguis domini nostri Jesu Christi, quod dicimus cum aliis eucharistiam distribuimus. Sunt et aliae multae orationes, quas quidem ad pacem et communionem privatim frequentant; sed diligentiores antiquiorum traditionum observatores nos in hujusmodi privatis orationibus brevitate studere docuerunt, potiusque publicis precibus in officio missae occupari voluerunt." (Hittorp, *De divinis officiis*, Bibliotheca Patr. x. 742.)

Many rites omit words of delivery at public communion.

[2] It must be confessed that opportunities for private experiment were provided by the not infrequent absence or paucity of rubrical directions

the usage that was in vogue before the introduction of intinction, where the Bread alone was held to suffice in clinical communions.

The conclusions to which this review of the first ten centuries lead are briefly these. The definite directions as to constant reservation that first appear in the era of Carolingian reform do not introduce a new or unfamiliar practice.[1] They merely insist upon due observance being maintained of existing custom, and appear to have given sanction in certain areas to modifications of the primitive type of official reservation. The most important of these modifications was the substitution of an intincted for a simple Host.

in the rite of administration to the sick, and by the omission or varying form of the words of delivery in some *ordines*.

[1] The view here taken is not prejudiced by the fact that insistence upon the duty of reserving the sacrament coincided with legislation against celebrating the Eucharist in private houses for the sake of the sick, *e.g.* Council of Metz (A.D. 888), *can.* 9. Reference to chapter iii will show that the attitude taken with regard to performance of the Liturgy in non-consecrated buildings was fairly constant from early times. The legislation of this era on the point is only one of the symptoms of the quickened interest and zeal that produced the Carolingian reforms.

CHAPTER X

Official Reservation and the Eucharist Controversies of the Eleventh Century

A. The Different Forms of Intinction

In the preceding pages the term intinction has been used in a general sense, and no attention has yet been drawn to the fact that under this term are included three different usages. This is a convenient point at which to distinguish between the forms of intinction, and to describe them in what seems to be the chronological order of their appearance.

1. From very early times there was in use the practice of steeping the Host in some unconsecrated liquid in order to render more easy its consumption. This practice was confined to cases of clinical communion in which the recipient was wholly or partly unconscious, or in the extremity of weakness. Since there was no intention to do more than administer the consecrated Bread by itself in a form that could be easily swallowed, we may distinguish this sort of intinction by the term "non-sacramental." It would be a matter of indifference whether the liquid employed to steep the Host were water or wine, or a mixture of both.

In this manner, as we gather from the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria (preserved by Eusebius),[1] it was customary to communicate persons *in extremis* in the third century. Moreover, so long as the ancient tradition of using the single species of Bread for *viaticum* continued in general use, this form of intinction would doubtless be employed whenever necessary.

It is by no means certain, but it is not impossible, that the use of a Host saturated by some unconsecrated liquid is intended by the injunction contained in a canon of doubtful

[1] *H.E.* vi. 44. Scudamore (*N.E.*, p. 705) quotes pseudo-Prosper for another instance at Carthage in the fifth century.

date and unknown origin, where the minister is directed to pour (*infundere*) the Eucharist into the mouth of an unconscious penitent.[1] After a certain date, however, it is most difficult to decide whether an expression of this sort does not refer to one or the other of the later kinds of intinction, rather than to this simple and primitive expedient. Yet, by reason of its very simplicity, and because it involved the use of only the one consecrated species,[2] this "non-sacramental" type of intinction might well reappear in a period when other varieties were forbidden because they seemed to contradict the doctrine of concomitance.

When, therefore, the *consuetudines* of Cluny provide that, in communicating a sick brother, the Host is to be dipped into a mixture of wine and water, and no assertion is made about the effect of the action upon the liquid employed,[3] it is possible that the old custom has re-emerged after a period of neglect,[4] in which it had been superseded by other usages.

The reception of the sacrament was in this particular instance to be followed by a "*purificatio oris*," in which the ablutions of the chalice, that held the wine and water, and of the priest's fingers were employed.

Ultimately, the "*purificatio oris*" alone was found to be all that was necessary in most cases in order to ensure complete consumption of the Host; and the primitive sort of "non-sacramental" intinction disappeared again.

[1] (?) Concil. Leptinense (A.D. 743): "is qui poenitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit, oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit, vel in phrenesim versus fuerit; dent testimonium qui eum audierunt, et accipiat poenitentiam. Et si continuo creditur moriturus, reconciliatur per manus impositionem et infundatur ori eius eucharistia. Si supervixerit, admoneatur a supradictis testibus petitioni suae satisfactum:' et subdatur statutis poenitentiae legibus quamdiu sacerdos, qui poenitentiam dedit, probaverit."

Some authors have taken the sense to be that the penitent shall be communicated in the species of Wine alone. For discussion of date, etc., see p. 125.

[2] Of course, a Host previously intinct and dried could be steeped in unconsecrated liquid: either wine or water, according to the Leofric Missal, see p. 138, and cf. the Russian usage prescribed in the Trebnik, p. 253.

[3] *Statuta* 5. "ipsum autem domini corpus in vino aqua mixto intinguitur, quo epotato ebibit quoque ablutionem calicis et si potest ablutionem digitorum sacerdotis." (Martène, *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* V. viii. 19.)

[4] It is enjoined, *e.g.* by Giraldus Cambrensis, *Gemma Ecclesiast.* I. 9. (*R.S.* 21. 2. p. 29.)

2. By true or "sacramental" intinction is to be understood that variety in which both consecrated species are used. Of its origin and early history practically nothing is certainly known. There are no very satisfactory grounds for the assertion, so frequently made, that this form of administration arose in the East, and passed from thence to the rest of Christendom. On the contrary, indisputable references to true intinction in the Eastern Church are rare before the ninth century; and such early examples as are to be found occur only in association with clinical communion.[1] In the West the custom had become so usual in some parts of Spain by the seventh century that it formed the subject of unfavourable legislation. It would appear that it was this particular variety of intinction which was forbidden by the Third Council of Braga (A.D. 675). That this prohibition was ineffective at a later date so far as other parts of the Church were concerned, we have already seen. Intinction may or may not have become fairly general by the ninth century. After that period it was regarded in some dioceses of the empire as the proper manner in which the laity were to receive communion, and was used in preparing the sacrament for reservation. So far, then, as direct evidence is concerned, the West may have led the way in this matter.[2]

It is more probable, however, that the practice arose independently in the two areas, as a symptom of the process that culminated at last in the entire omission of the species of the chalice from the communion of the people in Western Christendom. The Easterns went no further with the development than conjoint delivery of the elements, and have since adhered to this usage which was once common to both parts of the Church.

A further point that has not yet been determined is whether intinction of this "sacramental" sort came first into use as the regular method employed in clinical administration, and was subsequently adopted into the

[1] *Apophthegm. Patrum* φ (*P.G.* lxv. 433). Life of St. Mary of Egypt. (Boll. *AA.SS.* (Ap. 2), p. 83).

[2] The only argument of weight for the early appearance in the East of intinction for communion of the people at the Liturgy is to be found in the fact that this usage is common to all the Oriental Churches, orthodox and schismatical. This in itself is by no means convincing.

public communion, or *vice versa*. We might venture to think that since there was already one simple and primitive usage of communicating the sick, it is more likely that "sacramental" intinction was first employed at the mass, as the earliest of the several expedients by which the chalice has been secured from exposure to accident. From this general use it may have passed into use at the bedside. Liturgical usages are not commonly initiated by the practical requirements of occasional offices.

As to conjoint delivery of the elements in the mass, it is clear that one of two modes might conceivably be followed. Either the act of intinction might be repeated at the communion of each individual; or the conjunction of the two species might be effected at some point after the consecration and before the communion of the people. The former of these methods, which was in use at Cluny in the tenth century,[1] clearly requires the presence of at least one assistant minister. For the alternative method we have no definite evidence, and it is precarious, in the absence of such support, to venture an opinion. Yet the conclusion seems inevitable that, where there was no second minister to bear the chalice, the intinction of the Hosts must have been previously performed at the altar, as it would be obviously impossible to intinct the Bread immediately before delivery to each communicant. In such circumstances the present long-standing custom of the Greek Church may have been followed. Intincted Hosts are prepared for the "Presanctified" and for *viaticum*, by dipping the communion-spoon (λαβίς) in the Wine and making a cross with it upon each loaf.[2] There is no

[1] *Antiq. Consuet. Cluniac.* 30: "quotquot autem ipsum corpus sacrum dederit singulis, sanguine prius intinguit." (D'Achery, *Spicileg.* I. p. 678.)

[2] The preparation of the Hosts for use at the communion of the Presanctified takes place in the prothesis of the preceding Sunday, and proceeds as follows: "*ὅτε δὲ μέλλει σφραγίσαι τοὺς ἄρτους, λέγει· ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἑνικῶς, ὡς εἷς ὁ χριστός. . . . καὶ ὅτε μέλλει ὑψῶσαι, ὑψοῖ ὅλους ὁμοῦ, καὶ μελίζει τὸν προσκομιζόμενον πρῶτον ἄρτον, καὶ τίθησι τὴν μερίδα ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ, καὶ ἐγχέει καὶ τὸ ζέον, ὡς ἔθος. εἶτα λαβὼν τὴν ἁγίαν λαβίδα μετὰ τῆν δεξιᾶς χειρὸς, βάψει αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ αἵματι. τῇ δὲ ἀριστερᾷ χειρὶ λαμβάνει ἕκαστον ἄρτον, καὶ εἰσφέρει τὴν ἁγίαν λαβίδα μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου αἵματος βεβαμμένην, καὶ ἐγγίζει ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ἄρτῳ*

evidence to show that a spoon was ever used in the West for delivery of the sacrament. But a similar instrument was, and in the Latin rite still is, employed in preparing the mingled wine and water, and for the removal of foreign bodies from the chalice. This, or perhaps the *fistula*, may well have served the purpose. In other cases, Hosts may have been lightly dipped, or even immersed, in the consecrated Wine.[1] So much, then, for sacramental intinction at the open communion.

In regard to the use of the "*eucharistia intincta*" at the communion of the sick, it is obvious that when, as was sometimes the case, the sacrament was actually consecrated in the sick room at a private celebration, the needs of the occasion would best be met by steeping the Host in the chalice immediately before administering it to the invalid, for in this state it would be most easily swallowed.

But the canon preserved in Regino insists upon the previous intinction of the sacrament that is to be reserved, in terms that hardly leave it doubtful that the true or "sacramental" form of intinction is intended;[2] and we may believe that the preparation of the Host destined to be reserved would coincide with the intinction of those intended for use at the open communion.[3]

σταυροειδῶς ἐν τῷ μέρει, ἐν ᾧ ἐχαράχθη ὁ σταυρὸς ὑπὸ τὴν ψιχά, καὶ ἀποτίθησι τοῦτον ἐν τῷ ἀρτοφορίῳ." Euchalog. Ἑρμηνεία τῆς θείας λειτουργίας τῶν προηγιασμένων.

See Neale, *Eastern Church*, ii. p. 716. cf. also the remark of the Patriarch Michael (1167) as to the omission of this ceremony at Constantinople. (Allatius, *De Missa Praesanct.* xvii. 1586.)

[1] As in the Armenian rite (Le Brun, Diss. x. art. 21. t. 5, p. 339). For the orthodox manner of preparing the conjoint *viaticum*, see chap. xvii.

[2] *Notitiae* I. 71: "quae sacra oblatio intincta debet esse in sanguine Christi; ut veraciter presbyter possit dicere infirmo: corpus et sanguis domini proficiat tibi," etc. For the full text see p. 136.

Sometimes the intincted Host was prepared at a mass specially said for this purpose, and was carried forth immediately after the service. cf. the directions given in pontifical of Narbonne (eleventh century): "dum unguendus est infirmus, celebret pro eo missam sacerdos. Deinde convenientibus omnibus, veniat et ipse cum portione corporis et sanguinis domini, quam portet levita," and the words of delivery are: "corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi sanguine suo tinctum conservet animam tuam in vitam aeternam. Amen." (Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. art. 4, ordo 13.)

[3] Maldonatus, cited by Scudamore (*N.E.* 675), remarks: "Because the priest could not steep the Eucharist at a more convenient time than at the

If the Hosts to be used for *viaticum* were not merely tinged with the Wine, but prepared by immersion in it, some superfluity of the liquid species could hardly be avoided. It is in such cases, we may suppose, that a chalice[1] was preferred to the pyx as the receptacle for the reserved sacrament. St. Odilia received the reserved elements conjointly from such a vessel;[2] and St. Peter Damian[3] has a story of a miracle worked by the few drops of the precious Blood that remained in a chalice after the Eucharist had been borne therein to a sick man.[4]

3. For some time a third variety of intinction was in common use. Here, as in the first kind, only the consecrated Bread was employed, but it was dipped into the usual mixture of wine and water in the belief that contact with the Host sufficed to consecrate the contents of the chalice. Therefore, since the intention is clearly to communicate the recipient in both kinds, this form of intinction becomes indistinguishable in effect from that in which both elements, previously consecrated, were employed.

Intinction of this "consecratory" kind seems to be something more than a modification of the simple process

fraction and communion, he therefore put a particle of the Host into the cup, and afterwards separated it with a spoon and reserved it." cf. the usage in the Orthodox Church.

[1] The "calices ad communicandos infirmos," of which mention occurs not uncommonly at this time, were not used for reservation. They contained the wine to be hallowed *e contactu hostiae* at clinical communion; or were used simply for the "purificatio oris." See chap. xiv. *Calix.*

[2] *Vita*, 22 (Krusch, *Passiones* (*M.G.H.*) vi. p. 50).

[3] *Opuscula Varia*, xlvii. 2. Rainaldus, Bishop of Como, tells the tale: "presbyter, inquit, in ecclesia cui, deo auctore, deservio, hodieque nisi fallor advivit, qui tam parvam ac tenuem in litterarum habet doctrina, ut aperte quoque scriptionis articulum syllabatim vix valeat legere; nimia tamen paupertate constrictus, utcumque missarum cogitur solemnia celebrare. Hic aliquando dum sacri muneris eucharistiam detulisset aegroto, ut erat utique deses et negligens, aliquantulum dominici sanguinis remansit in calice. Quod cum ille in ecclesiam rediens comperisset, sed fastidio praepeditus noluisset accipere, mox calicem lavit et in labrum marmoreum in quo erat aqua sanctificata, projecit. Et, o magnum divinae virtutis judicium! illam labri partem quam id quod effusum est de calice contigit, in sanguineum ruborem repente convertit. . . ." (*P.L.* cxlv. 712.)

[4] Under the head of sacramental intinction are to be reckoned the various forms of preparing and using the conjoint Eucharist that exist in the oriental churches, but for the sake of convenience the discussion of these is deferred to chap. xvii.

of soaking the Host. Its origin is rather to be sought in association with two usages of which the briefest description must here be made.

Before the eighth century—possibly long before—there was in vogue a custom of mingling, after the communion of the clergy, a portion of the consecrated Wine with a quantity of common wine in a large vessel (variously termed *calix ministerialis* or *communicalis*, *scyphus*, etc.) for the communion of the people. This custom provided a convenient method of augmenting the quantity of the consecrated element. It was doubtless anterior in origin to any exact theory as to the result of the action; but even at the first the mingled liquids were together spoken of as the Lord's Blood.[1]

A still closer resemblance exists between the "consecratory" form of intinction and the practice of placing a fragment of the Host in the chalice in order to hallow its contents for communion in the mass. The action of dropping a portion of the consecrated Bread into the cup was customary in several ceremonies, as we have seen in a preceding chapter.[2] But it is in the directions for the communion of the Presanctified in the ninth-century supplements to the *First Roman Ordo* that the actual consecration of the wine first seems definitely to be assumed.[3]

[1] *Caerimoniale S. Benigni Divionen.* "debet autem vinum in ampulla juxta eum (*scil.* diaconum) jugiter esse, ut quando opus esse perspexerit, eodem vino sanguinem dominicum augere possit." (Martène, *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* II. iv. 15, p. 64.)

The opinion that by this admixture the whole of the wine was actually consecrated did not live long. But with some show of reason it might be contended that the unconsecrated wine served as a vehicle for the Blood of the Lord; for if the two liquids were intimately mixed, a draught of the contents of the ministerial chalice would convey particles of the hallowed element to the communicant.

This method of increasing the quantity of the eucharistic Wine persisted locally until the thirteenth century. Durandus († 1296) in his *Rationale Divin. Offic.* iv. 42, 1, says: "unde in quibusdam locis post sumptionem corporis et sanguinis Christi aliquid de ipso sanguine reservatur in calice et superinfunditur vinum purum ut ipsi communicantes inde sumant: non enim esset decus tantum sanguinem conficere nec calix capax inveniretur." (*P.L.* lxxviii. 903.)

[2] Chap. vii.

[3] *Ordo Rom. Primus Append.* vi. 25. ". . . subdiaconus teneat . . . calicem cum vino non consecrato et alter diaconus patenam cum corpore

Again, as in the case of "sacramental" intinction, we cannot be certain whether it was in connection with the public ceremonies that the custom had its origin, or whether its employment for the purpose of clinical communion preceded any liturgical use of it. But, in spite of opposition, the theory that the chalice could be consecrated by the admixture or contact with the Host continued to be held for some considerable time and over a wide area. The theory left its mark, too, upon the usage of later times, after the opinion itself had been discarded.

As a mode of communicating the sick "consecratory" intinction possessed many practical advantages. It was only necessary to bring the Host, previously intincted or not, enclosed in the pyx, to the sick-room, and there to moisten it with an unconsecrated mixture of wine and water. Not only did this secure (according to the theory then accepted) the full communion of the invalid in both sacred species; but the form of a freshly-intincted Host was peculiarly well adapted to the houselling of one who lay weak or even unconscious.[1]

domini. . . . Cum dixerint *Amen*, sumit [pontifex] de sancta et ponit in calicem nihil dicens: et communicant omnes cum silentio . . ." (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* ii. p. 23.) According to Amalarius the practice of thus hallowing the contents of the chalice in the "Presanctified" had become obsolete at Rome in the ninth century, because it seemed to contravene the tradition that no consecration should take place on Good Friday and the following day. He quotes the *ordo* on which he comments as enjoining "ut duo presbyteri afferant post salutationem crucis corpus domini quod pridie reservatum fuit et calicem cum vino non consecrato, quod tunc consecretur et inde communicet populus." The practice lasted longer elsewhere, as appears from Amalarius' remarks. (*De Eccl. Offic.* l. 15.) (*P.L.* cv. 1032.) It is possibly indicated in a canon of Orange (441). See p. 204.

A modified form of belief taught that the wine was "sanctified" rather than consecrated by contact with the Host or by the admixture of a fragment thereof. St. Bernard of Clairvaux (*Ep.* lxix) says "liquorem etsi non ex consecratione propria atque solemni in sanguine mutatum, sacrum tamen fuisse ex contactu corporis sacri." (*Opera*, edit. Mabillon, i. 67.)

This view is retained, *e.g.* in the Hereford Missal and in the Cluniac Missal of 1530. (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* ii. p. lxxxviii.)

Further instances of consecration *e contactu hostiae* are given by Scudamore. (*N.E.* pp. 709 ff.)

[1] cf. the tenth-century rubric in the *Leofric Missal*: "hic communicetur infirmus et ponat (*scil.* sacerdos) sacrificium in vino *sive* aqua, dicens: fiat commixtio corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Jhesu Christi nobis et omnibus in remissionem omnium peccatorum et vitam aeternam. ℟. Amen."

We find this method recommended in the appendices to a late *Ordo Romanus*. The rite of sick communion there prescribed contains the injunction that "the priest shall then deliver him the Eucharist of the Lord's Body intincted in wine, and the wine that by such intinction has been consecrated and transmuted into the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, saying, 'Receive, brother, the *viaticum* of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and may He preserve thee from the malicious enemy and bring thee to eternal life.'"[1]

B. The Controversy about Intinction

The use from earliest times of the eucharistic Bread alone in private reservation, and the high probability that under this sole kind the sacrament was also at first officially reserved, lead us to recognize, that the belief, which later found expression as the doctrine of concomitance, was ever implicit in certain uses of the Eucharist sanctioned by the Church.[2] But, until this doctrine had been definitely

It would seem that a Host previously intincted was used in this instance, with the result that the distinction between the two forms of intinction is obscured. See p. 138 above.

[1] *Ordo x* in Mabillon (*op. cit.* p. 114). "Tunc tradat ei sacerdos eucharistiam dominici corporis intincti vino, et vinum tali intinctione sanctificatum in Christi sanguinem transmutatum, dicens: accipe, frater, viaticum corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Jesu Christi qui te custodiat ab hoste maligno et perducat te ad vitam aeternam."

[2] The term was coined by St. Thomas, but the formulation of the doctrine begins with Eutychius of Constantinople († A.D. 582) in the East and Isidore of Seville († A.D. 636) in the West. (See Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, i. pp. 140, 198.)

In our period Hildebert of Tours († 1133) is prominent as a teacher of this doctrine; *De Cena Domini*: "in acceptione sanguinis totum Christum, verum deum et hominem, et in acceptione corporis similiter totum." (*P.L.* clxxi. 535.) Witmund of Aversa, pupil of Lanfranc and opponent of Berengar, treats of an allied question: "eucharistiae sacrae perceptio non in quantitate sed in virtute consistit . . . tota hostia est corpus Christi ut nihilominus unaquaeque particula separata sit totum corpus Christi." (*P.L.* cxlix. 1434 f.) Anselm (*Ep.* iv. 107) is careful to combat the opinion of certain divines that either species conveys a special gift: "non tamen intelligendum est quod in sanguinis perceptione solam animam, non etiam corpus; vel in acceptione corporis solum corpus non etiam animam suscipiamus; sed in acceptione sanguinis totum Christum, deum et hominem, et in acceptione corporis similiter totum suscipiamus."

formulated by theologians, and had met with general acceptance,[1] there was room for the introduction of intinction, either of the "sacramental" or of the "consecratory" sort. Each of these modes of administration avoided any real or fancied inconveniences attached to the use of the chalice, and yet secured what was always considered the perfect and primitive ideal—the employment of both species. It was especially in clinical communion that the use of one or the other variety of intinction recommended itself by certain inherent advantages such as have already been discussed; and there is some evidence to show that during the ninth century definite attempts were made to bring the communion of the sick into closer conformity with the contemporary manner of communicating the people at mass. This was achieved sometimes by the reservation of intincted Hosts for *viaticum*, sometimes by "consecratory" intinction at the bedside.

We shall probably not be wrong in reckoning these modifications of ancient usage as a result of the Carolingian reforms—for, at that period, eucharistic theology began to acquire an importance to which it had never before attained.[2]

We have now to take note of the continuous witness for the use of intinction during the eleventh century, and at the same time see how a further phase of eucharistic controversy threw into confusion all existing custom in connection with the communion of the laity, and, in suppressing intinction, brought about an undesigned return to primitive tradition in the ministration of the Eucharist to the sick.

Widespread as the custom had become both at open and at clinical communion, intinction began again to find

(*P.L.* clix. 255.) Other theologians, *e.g.* Peter Lombard and Albertus Magnus, while asserting the sufficiency of *communio sub una specie*, admit the greater perfection, at least in symbol, of reception in both kinds. cf. also William of Champeaux, as quoted below, p. 159.

[1] It was not until the Council of Trent that concomitance was actually defined as *de fide*. Even at Constance (1415) the withdrawal of the chalice from the laity was treated only as a point of ecclesiastical discipline: "quod nullus presbyter sub poena excommunicationis communicet populum sub utraque specie panis et vini." (Sessio xiii. in Hard. *Concil.* viii. 382.)

[2] For the eucharistic controversy initiated by Paschasius Radbert, see Gore, *Dissertations*, pp. 236 ff.

opponents even before the close of the tenth century. This is plain from the writings of Abbo of Fleury († 1004), who, at that time, thought it necessary to apologize for the practice. "The example of Christ is quoted against it," he says, "Who delivered a piece of steeped bread to Judas the traitor, into whom Satan entered after the sop. Yes, but as one who knows all hidden things, He gave it, that He might thereby expose the lost disciple; whereas we, who are conscious of our own sins, offer the Eucharist to the brethren, not with this purpose but in commemoration of Christ."[1]

The old objection—that the intincted Host recalled the sop given to Judas—was strongly revived; and, stated in the terms employed by the Council of Braga, it gained the more acceptance because it appeared as a decree of the fourth-century Pope Julius I, and as such passed into Canon Law.[2]

In the eleventh century other factors came in to militate against the use of intinction. The strained relations existing between East and West were leading controversialists

[1] *Collectio Canon. ad Hugon.* (43) de communione: "attamen Christi exemplum occurit, qui Judae proditori intinctum panem porrexit, de quo scriptum est, quia post bucellam introivit in eum Satanas. Sed ille, ut secretorum non ignarus, ad ostensionem perditi discipuli panem porrexit: nos vero peccatorum nostrorum conscii, non ad ostensionem, sed ob commemorationem Christi, eucharistiam praebeamus fratri." (Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta.* (vol. iv of D'Achery, *Spicileg.* p. 146).)

[2] The "decree" (in Canon Law, *Decret.* III. ii. 7) is really a patchwork, of which the chief constituents were drawn from the first canon of the Third Council of Braga (A.D. 713) and from one promulged by the Fourth Council of Orleans (A.D. 541). No reference to intinction occurs in the latter source.

In part of the text subjoined the principal extracts from the authentic canon of Braga are indicated by italics:

(7). "... *audivimus* ... *alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere*, quos (*quosdam*) *etiam expressum vinum in sacramento dominici calicis offerre*; alios vero pannum lineum in musto intinctum per totum annum reservare, et in tempore sacrificii partem eius aqua lavare et sic offerre; *quod quam sit evangelicae et apostolicae doctrinae contrarium et consuetudini ecclesiasticae adversum* ... *Illud vero quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium rece*perunt *ubi apostolis corpus suum commendavit et sanguinem. Seorsum enim panis, et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum praebuisse non legimus, excepto* illo (*illi*) *tantum discipulo, quem intincta buccella magistri proditorem ostenderet, non quae sacramenti huius institutionem signaret.* ..." (Bruns., ii. 97.)

on either side to seize upon points of difference hitherto ignored, or at least regarded as unimportant, in order to emphasize the growing antagonism. For example, the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist having become fairly general in the West by the end of the ninth century, this was later elevated into a serious matter of disagreement between the Greeks and Latins by partisans on both sides.[1] Similarly, when Cardinal Humbert, bishop of Silva Candida, and papal legate, was busy collecting pretexts for abuse of the Easterns, he condemned intinction and the delivery of the sacrament in a spoon as undesirable customs that traversed the commands given at the institution of the Eucharist. He asserts that in the West the Bread and the Wine are administered separately.[2] This statement, which denies the existence of intinction among the Latins, is hard to reconcile with the facts of the case, for undoubtedly the practice was in full vigour in many parts of the West at this time. But his remarks serve to show how the custom would soon cease to be viewed as a matter of indifference when the absence of intinction could be cited in controversy with the Greeks. This consideration would therefore help to account for the growing disfavour with which the practice came to be regarded in the West. Yet this was after all a minor point. In any case intinction stood condemned as soon as ever the implications of concomitance were worked out. Moreover, toward the end of

[1] See Woolley, *Bread of the Eucharist* (Alcuin Club Tracts xi), pp. 18 ff. Neither the question of leavened and unleavened bread, nor the question of intinction was raised by Ratram in his *Contra Graecorum Opposita.* (*P.L.* cxxi. 223–346.)

[2] *Adv. Graecorum calumnias.* 32: "deinde quod sanctum panem vitae aeternae in calicem intritum cum cochleari sumere consuestis. ... Neque enim ipse dominus panem in calice vini intrivit et sic apostolis dedit, dicens: accipite et cum cochleari comedite; hoc est corpus meum. Sed, sicut sancta Romana ecclesia usque nunc observat, panem integrum benedixit et fractum singulis particulatim distribuit, dicens: accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum. Quibus, postquam coenatum est, calicem porrexit dicens: bibite ex eo omnes. ..." *c.* 33: "siquidem tenues oblatas ex simula praeparatas integras et sanas sacris altaribus nos quoque superponimus, et ex ipsis post consecrationem fractis cum populo communicamur. Et tunc demum calice meri et liquidi cruoris potamur: quandoquidem nemini discipulorum nisi Judae proditori intinctum panem a domino porrectum invenimus, significante quod eum esset traditurus; pari modo etiam residuum dominicae oblationis reponimus." (*P.L.* cxliii. 951, 952.)

the eleventh and during the early part of the succeeding century teachers like Hildebert of Tours and Anselm were asserting the doctrine in plainer terms than had ever been used before; while in certain localities zealous ecclesiastics were ready to carry the implication of this teaching to practical conclusions.

For some time, however, intinction did not lack supporters and apologists. Bishop John of Avranches († 1069), for example, while forbidding the clergy to receive intincted Hosts, defended the practice of communicating the people in this manner.[1] That is to say, he approved of the common Gallican usage of the preceding century, such as is described in the *Codex Ratoldi*,[2] in which the bishop is ordered to communicate the clergy above the rank of subdeacon with the separate species, while the subdeacons (and, by inference, all subordinate orders and lay folk) receive an intincted Host.[3] His defence of intinction is, as usual, made to rest upon an exaggerated fear of risk in administering the chalice to the laity. Anxiety on this score and the desire to avoid other forms of involuntary irreverence (which had already been the cause of several modifications in the administration of the chalice) were reinforced by the steadily growing acceptance of transubstantiation as the doctrine of the Church.[4]

[1] *De officiis eccles.*: "non autem intincto pane, sed juxta definitionem Toletani (*sic*) concilii seorsum corpore seorsum sanguine, sacerdos communicet, excepto populo, quem intincto pane, non auctoritate, sed summa necessitate timoris sanguinis Christi effusionis, permittitur communicare." (*P.L.* cxlvii. 37.)

[2] Ménard, *Gregorian Sacram.*: "episcopus communicet presbyteros et diaconos cum osculo pacis, sicco tamen sacrificio; et subdiaconos mixto sacrificio." *P.L.* lxxvii. 265. Custom varied from place to place: monastic usages frequently differed from those followed in secular churches. See Smend (*Kelchspendung*), pp. 21 ff and footnotes.

[3] cf. *Consuetud. Antiq. Cluniacen. Monast.* II. 30: "quotquot autem ipsum corpus sacrum dederit singulis sanguine prius intinguit." (D'Achery, *Spicileg.* I. 678; Martène, *De Ant. Mon. Rit.* II. iv. 15.)

[4] The term "*transubstantiatio*" occurs first in the writings of St. Peter Damian († 1071), if the treatise, *Expositio canon missae*, be really his (cc. 7, 14, 16; in *P.L.* cxlv. 883, 888, 889). See Darwell Stone, *Doctrine of Holy Eucharist*, I. pp. 259, 260. It is also used by Hildebert of Tours (*Serm.* xciii; in *P.L.* clxxi. 776), and the verb *transubstantiare* by Stephen of Autun († 1139) in his work *De sacramento altaris* (cc. 13, 14; in *P.L.* clxxii. 1291, 1293). Both noun and verb are generally used from the twelfth century. The Lateran Council of 1215, in authorizing the term and its implications, only set the seal to opinions that had for some time been current and powerful.

It was obviously open to an opponent of intinction to retort that the better way was to omit the second species altogether from the lay folks' houselling, since all were agreed that reception in the one kind was enough to procure the benefits of communion.[1] This argument, indeed, finally prevailed. But a worthy champion for intinction was found in the person of Ernulph, Bishop of Rochester. Early in the twelfth century he wrote a defence of the practice in reply to a correspondent who had asked him the reason why the communion was commonly delivered in a conjoint manner. Ernulph admits that the custom then in daily use was of comparatively recent growth, but he justifies it in a very able fashion. He draws attention to the fact that in instituting the sacraments our Saviour commands what we are to do, but leaves the manner of doing it to the discretion of the Church. No one is scandalized because customs and ceremonies have developed in connection with baptism; and the divine command to baptize contains no regulations about triple or simple immersion. As to the mere fact of mingling the two sacred species of the Eucharist, a priest does this whenever he performs the commixture, and no exception can be taken, therefore, to the act in itself. Then, of course, there is the objection that the conjoint sacrament resembles the sop given to the traitor. But, if this is allowed to have weight, we must be consistent and not only never use sops at our meals, but also abolish the kiss of peace; because by a kiss Judas betrayed his Lord. Every one knows that men's beards and moustaches are apt to be a cause of unintentional irreverence at communion when the chalice is used; and it is not to be expected that a priest should housel some of his flock in one way and some in another. Intinction seems to be a natural and reverent way of delivering the sacrament. If it is still further urged that a (papal) decree can be quoted against it, there are other cases of such decrees

[1] Certain divines of the period, *e.g.* Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, and Albertus Magnus, while asserting the sufficiency of the *communio sub una specie*, admitted the "greater perfection," at least in symbolism, of the fuller form of communion. See Scudamore, *N.E.*, pp. 718 ff., for quotations.

being overruled by the practice of the Church. The section of Ernulph's letter dealing with these points is subjoined at length below, for it is written with independence of judgement and practical wisdom beyond the common.[1]

[1] *Epist. II ad Lambertum*: "Prima ergo posita est percunctatio de sacramento altaris; ita proposita, ut quaeratur, cur hodierna ecclesiae consuetudo alio et pene contrario ritu censeat porrigi corpus dominicum quam a domino in coena discipulis suis fuerit distributum. Id enim quotidianus ecclesiae praetendit usus, ut tribuatur hostia sanguine intincta, cum a domino prius corpus, deinde sanguis porrectus fuisse memoretur. Quem etiam morem ecclesiae ex decretis Julii papae nitimini improbare, quibus idem papa dominicum commendat ordinem et apostolica confidentia ecclesiasticam arguit dispositionem, adjiciens intinctam panis buccellam dominum proditori suo contulisse. . . . De cuius dubietatis ambiguitate quod intelligimus, quod a nostris doctoribus accepimus, edicere parati sumus.

"Redemptor noster veniens in mundum quia propter hominum salutem inter homines apparuit, quaeque reparationi infirmitatis humanae commoda seu necessaria fore praevidit, sicut oportere vidit in sapientia sua ita ab hominibus fieri et esse voluit in ecclesia sua. Haec eis cum quibus conversari dignatus est, verbo vel exemplo insinuavit, quae facienda erant docens, certum quo facienda erant modo praefigere omittens. Hinc esse videtur quod ait, *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. Non ait, hoc modo facite. Et, *ite baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*. Non ait, hoc modo baptizate, non ait semel mergite aut tertio mergite. Non ait, scrutinium facite, chrisma sacrate. Qua in re insinuasse videtur quae praecepta sunt non fieri non licere; pro ratione vero necessitatis vel honestatis alio et alio modo fieri licere. . . . Qui ergo quaerit cur non accipiantur exemplo dominico singulatim, quae de altari sumuntur nova consuetudine simul mixta, simili ratione quaerere potest, cur non sumantur in simili loco aut de simili mensa vel in simili forma, aut cur etiam aliud sumatur, videlicet aqua, quae a domino non legitur in coena esse porrecta. Si vero ea necessariis causis intelligit rationabiliter esse parta ac reperta, noverit et ea de quibus quaeritur, et cur aliter fiant quam a domino facta sunt inquiritur, ratione non inferiori esse comparata. Porro cur miratur quispiam quod sacramenta porriguntur simul mixta? Nonne indesinenter in dominici corporis et sanguinis consecratione, diviso corpore in tres partes, una a sacerdote, videlicet quae ab ipso sumenda est, in calice reservatur, sanguini admiscetur, sanguine infunditur, cum sanguine sumitur? Quis sacerdotem peccare dicat dum in quotidiano tanti mysterii officio carnem cum sanguinis suscipit admixtione? Si ergo bonum est sumere hostiam sanguine infusam, malum erit sumere hostiam sanguine intinctam? Quod qui malum non esse agnoverit, desinet mirari, cum ratione factum esse cognoverit. Arguitur iste mos ex eo quod buccellae intinctae a domino traditori suo porrectae similitudinem videtur habere. Id si diligenter inspiciatur, nihil dignum reprehensione continere videbitur. Si enim exteriora pensentur nemo dicet justum hominem edere non debere panem intinctum in sua coena, quia id proditor manducavit Judas in dominica coena. Aut nemo ideo non dabit osculum pacis, quia Judas osculo dedit

Intinction was usual elsewhere than in England.

William of Champeaux (†1121), Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, and a friend of St. Bernard, also discusses the question; and, while fully admitting the sufficiency of communion in the one kind, was impatient of the objection

signum proditionis? Simili modo quid nobis obstat accipere corpus domini dominico sanguine intinctum, licet Judas accepit buccellam de manu domini dominico vino intinctam. Si autem interiora cogitemus, propter aliud ille, propter aliud nos. Ille in suae signum nequitiae, in signum doli et proditionis, quam mente gerebat, de manu domini buccellam intinctam intinctus fraude suscepit. Nos carnem domini intinguimus in sanguine domini, non ut designemus malitiam esse in cordibus nostris, sed ne accipientes, sive porrigentes, peccemus non habita forte competenti cautela in labiis et manibus nostris. Evenit enim frequenter ut barbati et prolixos habentes granos, dum poenlum inter epulas sumunt prius liquore pilos inficiant, quam ori liquorem infundant. Ii si accesserint ad altare liquorem sanctum bibituri, quo modo periculum devitare poterunt inter accipiendum, quomodo uterque, accipiens videlicet et porrigens, effugient grande peccatum? Praeterea si imberbes et sine granis, aut mulieres, ad sumendam communionem sanctam conveniant, quis sacerdotum poterit tam provide ministrare, tam caute calicem domini distribuère, ut multis eum singulatim dividat, dividens sic in ora eorum fundat, ut infundens nihil effundat? Saepe enim dum sibi soli calicem infundere disponit, negligentia aut imprudentia faciente effusionis periculum incurrit; quanto facilius in multitudine posito sacerdoti, multis diversarum formarum ministranti, contingere potest, unde graviter offendat, unde eum asperam poenitentiam agere oporteat?

"Ne ergo polluamus sanguinem nostrae redemptionis, ne tamquam impietatis manibus effundamus poculum humanae salutis, a religiosis viris provide actum est, ut dominici portiuncula corporis non sicca, sicut dominum egisse novimus, porrigatur, sed domini infusa sanguine fidelibus tribuatur. Quo pacto evenit, ut secundum salvatoris praeceptum eius carnem edat, sanguinem bibat, periculum evadat, quem in tanta re offendere oppido formidat. Id enim solidum edimus, id liquidum bibimus, quod simul separatimve ore sumptum per guttum trajicimus: in qua distributione nemo ut dictum est formidare debet, quod buccella panis intincta proditori domini a domino similiter est porrecta. Non enim ea operatio congruam habet similitudinem, quae causae habet dissimilitudinem. Unde Julii papae decreta quamquam rationabiliter data perfuere, apud aliquos modernos hac in parte quievere, ecclesiae praevaluit consuetudo, quae pondere rationis antecellit eminentiore. Nec mirum, rationabilem usum tantis actum necessariis causis Julii decretis anteponi, cum legamus et ipsis quotidianis actionibus frequentari videamus, caeterorum instituta pontificum propter similes, aut inferioris, ut videtur, generis causas discretiore prudentia esse mutata. Telesphorus papa in decretis suis missarum officia qua hora celebranda sint, his verbis absolvit. 'Nocte sancta nativitatis domini missas celebrent, etc. Reliquis temporibus missarum celebrationes ante horam diei tertiam minine sunt celebrandae, quia eadem hora et dominus crucifixus et super apostolos Spiritus Sanctus descendisse legitur.' Quod cujus

commonly urged against intinction. "As to reception of the Eucharist," he says, "there is a certain diversity of practice, based upon various reasons, but it is really all one and the same thing. Reception of the intincted Bread has been forbidden on a frivolous pretext; namely, on account of the intincted morsel which the Lord delivered to Judas in order to expose him." Then he goes on to show that although the separate reception of the two species serves to bring to mind the manner of our Lord's offering of Himself; yet Christ in His entirety is received under either species. This, he says, is clear from the fact that infants are communicated, immediately after baptism, from the chalice alone.[1]

decretum quam pauci servavere, quam multi abjecere, testatur ecclesiastici frequentia servitii; testatur ipsa pro fidelibus vivis ac defunctis sacerdotalis oratio et domini corporis et sanguinis quotidiana immolatio, testatur necnon pro se ac suis sive id fieri petens, seu praesentiam suam exhibens popularis multitudo. Intellexerunt enim satius esse, multis horis multas fieri oblationes quam usque ad horam tertiam pluribus omissis paucarum oblationum fieri dilationes. Similiter Victor papa in decretis suis docet baptismum faciendum esse in pascha, sic dicens: 'eodem tempore, id est paschae, baptismus est celebrandus catholicis. Si tamen mortis periculum ingruerit, gentiles ad fidem venientes quocumque loco, vel tempore baptizentur,'" etc. (D'Achery, *op. cit.* III. pp. 471, 472.)

[1] *De sacramento altaris*: "De perceptione eucharistiae diversi quidem usus sunt secundum aliquas causas, sed res eadem. Quod enim panis intinctus prohibitus est accipi, ex frivola causa fuit, scilicet pro buccella intincta, quam dominus Iudae ad distinctionem porrexit: tamen cum fide bonum est. Item quod utraque species per se accipitur, eo fit, ut memoria corporis quod in cruce visibiliter pependit, et memoria sanguinis qui cum aqua de latere fluxit, arctius teneatur, et quasi praesentetur. Tamen sciendum, quod qui alteram speciem accipit, totum Christum accipit. Non enim accipitur Christus membratim vel paullatim, sed totus, vel in utraque specie, vel in altera. Unde et infantulis mox baptizatis solus calix datur, quia pane uti non possunt, et in calice totum Christum accipiunt. Dandus autem est calix eis, quia sicut non potest ad vitam quis ingredi sine baptismo, ita nec sine hoc vitali viatico. . . . Quod ergo dicitur utramque speciem opportere accipi, haeresis plane est. Quamvis enim utraque sacramenta ibi sint secundum fractionem et odorem et colorem et saporem; tamen in utraque specie totus est Christus, qui post resurrectionem quidem ex toto est invisibilis, impassibilis, indivisibilis; ita ut nec sanguis sine carne, nec caro sine sanguine, nec utrumque sine anima humana, nec tota humana natura sine Verbo Dei sibi personaliter counito. Et ideo licet in alterutra specie totus sumatur; tamen pro causa praedicta sacramentum utriusque speciei ab ecclesia immutabiliter retinetur. Sunt enim in ecclesia sacramenta quae mutari licet, sunt quae non licet; ut de aqua baptismi, de his speciebus, de oleo consecrationis. . . ." (*P.L.* clxiii. 1039.)

But, in spite of all that might be said in its favour by isolated theologians, Intinction was doomed. Anselm was the dominant figure of the time, and under his guidance England led the way in applying the practical implications of concomitance. Robert Pullen († 1150), an eager partisan of the dominant theory, asked rhetorically, "Who will dare to join together that which the Lord preferred to minister apart?"[1] The final blow was dealt to intinction in this country in 1175, when a Synod sitting at Westminster forbade the practice altogether; still on the supposition that an early Pope was the author of the prohibition to which reference has so often been made in this chapter.[2]

Now, as intinction was falling into disrepute and at last came to be forbidden, it is clear that appeal might be made to earlier precedent for the restoration of the

[1] *Sentent.* viii. c. 3: "Qualiter a laicis Eucharistia sumi deberet, sponsae suae commisit judicio, cuius consilio et usu pulchre fit, ut Caro Christi laicis distribuatur. Nimirum periculose fieret, ut Sanguis sub liquida specie multitudini fidelium in ecclesia divideretur, longe periculosius infirmatis per parochiam deferretur. Nam quia Caro absque Sanguine non est, nec Sanguis alibi est nisi in Carne, quisquis alterutrum sumit, neutrum insumptum derelinquit. Quod si bene credit, non tamen se bene credere ostendit, quisquis dum Carnem tribuit, Sanguine intingit, quasi aut Caro Sanguine careat, aut Sanguis extra Carnem existat. Libere utique et secure fatendum est, alterum absque altero sumi non posse; dubiumque non est, quin si cui, ut facilius insumatur, pervalde infirmato Sanguis infunditur, satisfactum sit communioni. Nam panem intinctum quis audeat porrigere, cum Dominus per se panem, per se calicem porrexerit? Quis audeat conjungere, quae Dominus maluit separata ministrare? — Sed dices: absque exemplo Domini cur non praebeam intinctum, cum tu praebere non dubites alterum sine altero? Dispensatio ecclesiae, ne quid inconvenientis suboriatur utrumque circumferre non consuevit, eademque ratione vitans effusionem, intingere pertimescit. Intinctus panis intinctae inquinataeque mentis viro tradebatur Iudae. Nihil tale taliterque fidelibus exhibeatur. Tamen pleraque per loca panis intinctus porrigitur, quatenus, ut aiunt, et iuxta evangelium utrumque distribuatur et res ita securius atque expeditius transagitur. Verum et Christus aliter fecit, et id mutari auctoritas Romana obnixe interdicit." (*P.L.* clxxxvi. 963, 964.)

[2] *Can.* 16: "Inhibemus ne quis quasi pro complemento communionis intinctam alicui Eucharistiam tradat. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum praebuisse non legimus excepto illi tantum discipulo, quem intincta buccella magistri proditorem ostenderit, non quae Sacramenti huius institutionem signaret." (Hard. vi, pt. 2, 1638.)

communion of the people in both species separately. To lodge such an appeal would be to ignore the real causes for which intinction had encountered disapproval; yet, in point of fact, it was actually made. Echoes of the controversy are found in the work of Micrologus, who is probably to be identified with Bernold of Constance († 1100).[1] He argues from the *Ordines Romani* against intinction, but at the same time he adduces against communion in the sole kind of Bread that prohibition which was supposed to have been put forth in the fifth century by Pope Gelasius against the Manichees.[2] His remarks apply to the communion at the mass, from which the old regular custom of separate delivery to the laity had never wholly disappeared, even in those parts of the Western Church where intinction had become the prevailing fashion.

The ruling of the Council of Claremont (1095) was in favour of separate administration, and the use of the conjoint sacrament was confined to cases of necessity, or where some risk was involved in the use of the chalice.[3] The same policy was approved by Pope Paschal about the same time.[4]

It is possible to cite writers of this period, including

[1] *de eccles. observat.* 29: "de vitanda intinctione: non est autem authenticum quod quidam Corpus Domini intinguunt et intinctum pro complemento communionis populo distribuunt. Nam *Ordo Romanus* contradicit, quia et in Parasceve vinum non consecratum cum dominica oratione et dominici Corporis immissione jubet consecrare ut populus plene possit communicare. Quod utique superflue praecipere si intinctum dominicum a priore die Corpus servaretur et intinctum populo ad communicandum sufficere videretur. Julius quoque papa in ordine trigesimus sextus, episcopis Aegypti scribens, huiusmodi intinctionem penitus prohibet, et seorsum panem, seorsum calicem, juxta dominicam institutionem sumenda docet. Unde et beatus Gelasius Papa . . . scribens quibusdam episcopis, excommunicari illos praecipit, quicumque sumpto Corpore dominico a calicis participatione se abstinerent." (Hittorp, *op. cit.* p. 742.)

[2] As before remarked, this decree cannot with any certainty be ascribed to Gelasius: "comperimus . . . quod . . . sumpta tantum Corporis sacri portione, a calice sacri Cruoris abstineant . . . aut integra Sacramenta percipiant aut ab integris arceantur." (*P.L.* clxxxvii. 1736.)

[3] *Can.* 28: "Ne aliquis communicet de altari nisi Corpus separatim et Sanguinem similiter nisi per necessitatem et cautelam." (Hard. vi, pt. 2, 1719.)

[4] See the passage quoted below, p. 170.

some of the most prominent theologians of the day, who appear to regard separate delivery of the elements to the laity as the rule at the public communion. Ivo of Chartres († *c.* 1115) includes the Gelasian injunction in his *Decretal*,[1] and elsewhere speaks as though the reception of the two distinct species by the laity were usual.[2] Lanfranc, writing after 1063, says that "the Flesh of the Lord is that which we receive in the sacrament hidden under the form of bread, and that is His Blood which we drink under the appearance and taste of wine."[3] He may not have had in mind the communion of the people, but Rupert of Deutz († 1135) is certainly speaking of the faithful generally when he says that the Bread and Wine placed by the priest in their mouths is consumed and passes away.[4] Honorius of Autun († after 1130) is even more explicit: "the people who have been redeemed by the Blood of Christ and washed in the water of Baptism, communicate in Christ by feeding upon this Food and by drinking this Wine."[5] Elsewhere he refers to the deacon's privilege of distributing in the church the sacred Blood.[6] St. Bernard, writing against the early Albigenses, alludes to the existence of evil priests who none the less, by virtue of their office, distribute the Body and Blood of the Lord to good and bad alike. Lower down in the same treatise he speaks of the Blood of the Lord being set before us in the appearance of wine, and being tasted and drunk under this form.[7] The list might be extended, but here

[1] *Decret.* II, de Corpore et Sang. Dom. 89. (*P.L.* clxi. 182.)

[2] *Serm.* I. (de sacramentis neophytorum): "unde etiam, si eius est valetudinis, sacramentis unitatis, id est Christi Corpore et Sanguine, confirmatur." (*P.L.* clxii. 512.) Again, "Ipsi qui sumimus communionem sancti panis et calicis unum Christi Corpus efficimur." (*P.L.* cxlix. 1434.)

[3] *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*: "caro eius est quam forma panis opertam in Sacramento accipimus, et Sanguis eius, quem sub vini specie ac sapore potamus." (*P.L.* cl. 423.)

[4] *de officiis divinis.* II. 9: "cum in ora fidelium sacerdos distribuit, panis et vinum adsumitur et transit." (*P.L.* clxx. 40 f.)

[5] *Gemma animae* I. 33: "quia populus Sanguine Christi redemptus per aquam baptismatis ablutus per pastum huius cibi et per potum huius vini Christo communicatur." (*P.L.* clxxii. 555 f.)

[6] *op. cit.* 180: "diaconorum officium est in ecclesia Sanguinem Domini distribuere." (*P.L.* clxxii. 599.)

[7] *adv. Catharos. Serm.* 11: "Dominus tolerat malos sacerdotes et sinit eos potestatem habere in ecclesia et distribuere Corpus et Sanguinem

are names enough to show that, in spite of the growth of other customs, the primitive manner of communicating at mass either survived in many places or was reassumed after intinction had begun to pass out of use. At the most, however, this perpetuation of, or reversion to, separate administration of the elements to the laity was only a temporary phase.

For, apart from the main factor in this matter, *i.e.* the dominance of concomitance, the atmosphere of the time was in every respect favourable to the development of the discipline by which the sacrament of the chalice was withdrawn entirely from the communion of the people. The carefulness in regard to the material of the Eucharist that the penitentials had fostered was magnified, under the influence of those opinions that had issued victorious from the Berengarian controversy, into extreme scrupulosity concerning the remotest risk of mishap. The lines of Rudolph of St. Trond express perfectly the mind of his age:—

> "Every where let this precaution be had; that the priest
> to lay-folk, sick and whole, deliver not the Blood of Christ.
> For it might lightly be spilled; and the simple would think
> that Jesus in His fullness is not in each kind."[1]

Therefore we find Papal authority, in the person of Innocent III, deciding in the early years of the thirteenth century that intinction must cease,[2] and that henceforth

suum tam bonis quam malis . . . Sanguis dominicus in specie vini nobis praesentatur et in sapore vini gustatur et hauritur." (*P.L.* cxcv. 88 f.)

[1] "Hic et ibi cautela fiat ne presbyter aegris
aut sanis tribuat laicis de Sanguine Christi.
Nam fundi posset leviter; simplexque putaret
Quod non sub specie sit totus Jesus utraque."
(*P.L.* clxxiii. 193 f.)

Contrast, however, instructions issued under Richard Marsh, Bishop of Durham, in a Synod *c.* 1220: "Instruere insuper debetis laicos quoties communicant quod de veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi nullo modo dubitent. Nam hoc accipiunt, procul dubio, sub panis specie, quod pro nobis pependit in cruce. Hoc accipiunt in calice quod effusum est de Christi latere. Hoc bibunt, dicit Augustinus, credentes quod prius fuderunt saevientes." (Wilkins, *Concil.* i. 578.)

[2] *de sacro altar. myst.* vi. 13: "Quia vero Christus buccellam intinctam Judae porrexit. Unde constitutum est ab ecclesia ut Eucharistia non detur intincta." (*P.L.* ccxvii. 866.)

statements that contradict the doctrine of concomitance will be regarded as heretical.[1]

C. THE EFFECT OF THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT INTINCTION UPON CLINICAL COMMUNION

As regards clinical communion, it is evident that reaction against intinction would not be able at this date to import the novel expedient of reserving the consecrated Wine. The use of intinction in connection with reservation was itself an innovation upon the primitive tradition; and the obvious result of discarding the use of intincted Hosts and of consecration *e contactu hostiae* in the sick room would be a return to the reservation and administration of the eucharistic Bread alone. Wherever the separate use of the two species as *viaticum* is stated or clearly implied in biographical notices of this period we may be fairly certain that the sacrament given in this manner was brought to the invalid from the Liturgy. This was the case, for example, in the last communion of a lay-brother at Marmoutier, of whom it is related that he received the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord; "and then, when he had drunk some wine after the Blood, he expired in the hands of those who bore him."[2] Lewis the Fat, King of France († 1137), received both kinds separately as his *viaticum*; but the sacrament was brought to him straight from the church where mass had been said for this very purpose.[3] There

[1] *ibid.*: "Constitutum est nihilominus et pro haeresi exstirpanda quae dogmatizavit Christum sub neutra specie totum existere sed sub utraque simul existere totum." (*P.L. loc. cit.*)

[2] "Mane adveniente pro bona iterum devotione dominici Corporis et Sanguinis Sacramenta percepit: ubi, cum post Sanguinem vinum ebibisset, inter manus sese baintantium exspiravit." (Cited by Mabillon, *Praefationes ad AA.SS.*, Saec. Sext. 96, p. 515).

[3] *Vita*: ". . . quaerit rejecto pudore omni ob reverentiam divinitatis et sanctorum angelorum coram devotissime confiteri et securissimo Dominici Corporis et Sanguinis viatico exitum suum muniri. Cum idipsum praeparare festinant, rex ipse inopinate se levans et praeparans vestitus cameram cunctis admirantibus obviam Corpori Domini nostri Jesu Christi exit, devotissime assistit . . . humillime flexis genibus ante sacratissimum Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi (qui enim mox missam celebraverant illuc ei cum processione devote attulerant) in hanc oris et cordis verae et catholicae confessionis vocem, non tanquam illiteratus, sed

is no need to labour the point, but it may be worth while to point out that no reliance may be placed at this date upon the mere verbal form of statements concerning *viaticum*, as is evident from many instances where expressions implying the use of the one kind are employed interchangeably with the mention of both. For example, St. Robert of Arbrisselle († 1130), falling ill on a journey, asked (according to his biographer) for *viaticum* of the Body and Blood of the Lord, while the narrative goes on to say that he actually received the *Corpus dominicum*, and the other species is not named again.[1] Again, the use of the plural *sacramenta* in such phrases as *sacramenta dominici Corporis et Sanguinis* is not in itself sufficient ground for supposing that anything else but the non-intincted Host is intended.[2]

tanquam literatissimus theologus erumpit. 'Ego peccator Ludovicus confiteor. . . . Hanc autem sacratissimi Corporis eius eucharistiam illud idem credimus Corpus quod assumptum est de virgine. . . . Hunc sacratissimum Sanguinem illum eundem qui de latere eius pendentis in cruce defluxit. . . .' Cum autem . . . devotissime Corpori et Sanguini Jesu Christi communicasset, ad cameram rediit." (*P.L.* clxxxvi. 1337, 1338.)

[1] *Vita* (Andrew of Fontevrault (?)). (*P.L.* clxii. 1070, 1071.)

[2] *e.g. Vita St. Geraldi* († 1090): "Sumptis . . . sacrosanctis dominici Corporis et Sanguinis . . . sacramentis." (*AA.SS.*, April 5th.) *Vita St. Theotonii* († 1166): "Sacramento Domini Corporis et Sanguinis se munivit." (*AA.SS.*, February 18th.)

It may be of interest to add a few notices of the last communion to show the various expressions commonly used in this connection at the period. Pope Leo IX († 1054) died, "munitus Corporis et Sanguinis Domini communione." (*Acta*, auct. Wiberto 11. 6. *P.L.* cxliii. 503.)

Of the death of St. Bernard the Penitent († 1182) it is said: "et primo quidem, ut moris est, Corpore et Sanguine illius cuius ipse erat membrum eum munientes . . ." (*AA.SS.*, April 19th.) In the thirteenth-century Life of St. Notker Balbulus: "munitus est viatico sacrosancti mysterii Corporis et Sanguinis Christi." (*AA.SS.*, April 6th.)

Hugh de Flavigny's Life of the Abbot Richard (eleventh century): "viatico coelesti pastus." (*AA.SS.*, June 14th.) St. Odilo († 1049): "Salutaris Eucharistiae sacramenta percepit." (*Vita*, *AA.SS.*, January 1st.) "Guarinum abbatem Uticensem . . . dominici salvifica perceptione." (Twelfth century, *AA.SS.*, February 6th.) St. Gilbert of Sempringham († 1189) received the communion "Corporis Domini" (*Vita*, *AA.SS.*, February 4th); St. Hildegund († 1188), "Corpore dominico sibi dato." And her mother died, "accepto sacrosancto dominici Corporis viatico." (*Vita*, *AA.SS.*, April 2nd.) St. William of Bourges († 1209): "coelesti pane refici instantissime postulavit." (*AA.SS.*, January 10th.)

Naturally the practical results of contemporary theological development made their way and established themselves more rapidly in some places than in others. We may believe that changes in the manner of communicating affected the religious houses more slowly than the secular churches. The tendency of monasticism in such matters is conservative. Yet it is to monastic sources that we must go if we wish to have a full record of these changes.

From successive *Consuetudines* of one monastery alone (the famous house of Cluny) we are able to gather an interesting series of directions for the communion of sick brethren and of others to whom the monks were called upon from time to time to minister.

A study of these directions will serve to show how unsettled at this period were the customs in use at communion, open and clinical; and, at the same time, to indicate the general drift towards the use of the eucharistic Bread alone as sufficient at all times for participation in the sacrament.

We have first a set of customs from the first half of the eleventh century that until lately were supposed to have originated at Farfa, but in fact belong to Cluny.[1] These contain rather bare statements to the effect that, after Unction has been administered, the Host (*Corpus Domini*) is to be fetched for the invalid from the church where it is reserved, and to be brought into his presence with some ceremony; that the invalid is to raise himself as well as he can, out of reverence for the Eucharist; and that the priest shall communicate him, and then wash his (own) fingers in wine. Who is to consume these ablutions is not stated.[2]

[1] *Revue Bénédictine* xvii. pp. 164, 165; xxiv. pp. 374–385. Cited by Miss R. Graham, *Relation of Cluny to some other Movements of Monastic Reform*, J. T. S. xv. No. 58, January, 1914, whose conclusions are followed in the text.

[2] "*Consuetudines Farfenses*": "dum hec patrantur sacerdos cum quattuor conversis pergat in ecclesiam et tollat inde Corpus Domini et calicem desuper opertum mappula, et duo conversi accipiant candelabra, tertius turibulum et quartus ampullam cum vino, et tunc veniant hos psalmos decantando, *Miserere mei Deus, Deus in nomine tuo, Deus misereatur, Deus in adjutorium*. Cum domum intrare caeperint omnes flectant genua contra dominicum Corpus, etiam ipse infirmus in quantum se valet erigere,

But while no mention is made in these *Consuetudines* of any other kind than the Bread, we learn from Udalric, who wrote about the same time, that while at the open communion the Hosts were intincted in the consecrated Wine before being delivered to each communicant,[1] in communicating the sick the Host was dipped in *un*consecrated wine.[2] The discrepancies between these two almost contemporary accounts may be due to the fact that Udalric's version is a recension of earlier *Consuetudines* compiled by a writer named Bernard. At the same time, we must believe that Udalric describes the practice with which he was himself familiar.[3]

Toward the end of the century William, Abbot of Hirschau, who wished to form his house on the Cluny model, and was not content with the customs that Udalric had composed, sent to the house for further information.

et tunc communicet eum, ac profundat digitum suum cum vino. Psalmos denique expletos dicant *Kyrie eleison, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster.* Capitula: *Ostende nobis, Mitte ei dominus, Nichil proficiat inimicus, Esto ei domine turris fortitudinis,* et hanc orationem, *Deus, qui famulo tuo Ezechia,* et alias quae sequuntur. Post hec osculetur isdem infirmus crucem atque omnes fratres etiam infantes. His expletis incipiat abbas psalmum, *Miserere mei Deus*; et sic omnes cum silentio recedant." (Albers, *Consuetudines Monasticae*, I, p. 191.)

[1] *Antiquiores Consuetud. Cluniacens.* II. 30: "debent autem singuli ita se scutellae adjungere ut si forte inter sumendum Corpus Domini aliquando vel de ore sumentis vel de manu porrigentis lapsum fuerit, nisi in scutellam cadere non potest. Quotquot autem ipsum Corpus sacrum dederit singulis Sanguine prius intinguit." (D'Achery, *Spicileg.* I. p. 678.)

[2] *ibid.* III. 28: "Si autem communionem sacram percepturus est, tunc ab alio dicuntur praefatae collectae, et ipse interim sacerdos, cruce et aqua benedicta remanentibus, redit cum geminis candelabris ad ecclesiam ut Corpus Domini apportet, quod accepturus prius veniam petit et prius incensat, frangit, et partem quam allaturus est, super calicem tenet; et tam ipse calix, quam manus sacerdotis, linteolo candidissimo cooperitur. Quicumque illi obviaverint, veniam petunt. Interea curatur ut infirmi bucca lavetur recepturi ipsum Corpus Domini, quod recipit vino intinctum: quo epotato, ebibit quoque ablutionem calicis et secundo ablutionem digitorum sacerdotis et adhuc tertio calicis. Adhibetur illi crux ut eam osculetur: osculatur etiam quasi ultimum vale facturus, primo sacerdotem, deinde omnes fratres, ipsos quoque pueros. Redit conventus rursus imposito L psalmo." (D'Achery, *op. cit.* p. 700.)

[3] It is possible that the *Corpus Domini* of the first-mentioned *Consuetudines* is the intincted Eucharist. cf. the language of the twelfth-century monastic *ordo ad communicandum infirmum* given above, p. 139.

He then drew up a new and wordy code in which Udalric's version and other sources were laid under contribution and expanded. In this there is no mention whatever of intinction at the mass. Host and chalice are ministered separately, and augmentation of the Wine is permitted.[1] But the Host is still steeped in common wine for the communion of the sick.[2]

Only a few years later, somewhere between 1109 and 1118, Pope Paschal II, who was in frequent correspondence with the Abbots of Cluny, insisted, in a letter to the Abbot Pontius, that the two eucharistic elements should be

[1] *Constit. Hirsaugiens.* I. 84: "statim (*scil.* sacerdos, accepta Corporis dominici portione) diacono Corpus Domini tribuit ac deinde ipse sanguinem sumit et calicem diacono dat. Cum quo ille mox in competentem locum secedit, ut ipse, et si quis de fratribus Corpus Domini sumpsit, de eodem Sanguine Domini communicare possint. Deinde vero subdiaconus Corpus Domini accipit, et post eum omnes qui volunt, ac novissime minister, qui tenet scutellam si quid remanet . . . debent autem singuli scutellae ita se adiungere ut si forte inter sumendum aliquando Corpus Domini vel de ore sumentis vel de manu tribuentis lapsum fuerit non nisi in scutellam cadere possit . . . postquam autem subdiaconus Corpus Domini acceperit, statim ad diaconum cum arundine et ampulla venit, de qua vinum in calicem fundit cum Sanguinem deinde a bibentibus minui viderit . . . postquam omnes dominico Sanguini communicaverint qui Corpus Domini acceperant, novissime ministro defertur, ut et ipse de eodem Domini Sanguine bibat, si tamen Corpus Domini acceperat: nam ex usu non communicat, nisi aliqua pars Corporis Domini remaneat." (*P.L.* cl. 1013, 1014.)

[2] *ibid.* II. 72: "si autem res exigit ut Corpus Domini accepturus sit, tunc armario designante, alius sacerdos easdem collectas prosequitur et sacerdos interim, cruce et aqua benedicta remanentibus, redit cum geminis candelabris ad ecclesiam ut Corpus Domini apportet. Ibi denuo lotis manibus vinum et aquam calici infundit et priusquam illud accipiat tantum inclinat, et pixide, in qua Corpus Domini, quod reconditum est, super altare posita, crucem cum incenso quod sacrista interim ad hoc paravit desuper facit, et Corpus Domini, quod super calicem frangit et partem quam delaturus est, super calicem tenet, et tam manus sacerdotis quam ipse calix linteo candidissimo per armarium cooperitur; item ut prius imposito psalmo *Laudate* revertitur. Cui etiam, si opus est, psalmus *Deus in nomine tuo*, et *Miserere mei Deus* adduntur. Quoscumque pertransierit, vel qui illi obviaverint, veniam petunt. Nec minus interim curatur, ut os infirmi lavetur. Recepturus Domini Corpus confessionem dicit, sacerdote caeterisque respondentibus, *Misereatur vestri.* Quo dicto subiungit sacerdos, *Indulgentiam*, etc. Recipiet autem intinctum de vino. Sed deinde hausto eodem vino, ebibit quoque ablutionem calicis, et secundo ablutionem digitorum sacerdotis et adhuc tertio calicis," etc. (*P.L.* cl. 1133.)

delivered separately at communion. He allowed departure from this rule only in the case of such infants as the monks baptized, and of the sick who could not swallow. In these circumstances the Wine alone need be used.[1]

Later in the same century, perhaps about the year 1132, the Abbot Peter the Venerable undertook a reform of the monastery, and a new set of *Consuetudines*, under the title of *Statuta*, was put forth. In this version wine is still used for moistening the Host at clinical communion, but it is to be mixed with water.[2] If the intention of Paschal II was to do away with Intinction altogether, it seems that his ruling was disregarded.

Closely associated with the Cluny customs are Lanfranc's *Statutes*, written *c.* 1077. They contain no mention of the intincted species, except in the Presanctified; and in pre-

[1] *Epist.* (85) *ad Pontium*: "... scribens ad Caecilium B. Cyprianus ait: 'Quando aliquid Deo inspirante et mandante praecipitur, necesse est Domino servus fidelis obtemperet, excusatus apud omnes quod nihil sibi arroganter assumet, ne aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecit.' Igitur in sumendo Corpore et Sanguine Domini, juxta eundem Cyprianum, dominica traditio servetur, nec ab eo quod Christus magister et praecepit et gessit, humana et novella institutione discedatur. Novimus enim per se panem per se vinum ab ipso Domino traditum. Quem morem sic semper in sancta ecclesia conservandum docemus atque praecipimus, praeter in parvulis ac omnino infirmis, qui panem absorbere non possunt; quibus satis communicare in Sanguine." (*P.L.* clxiii. 442.)

[2] *Statuta* 5: "Si autem communionem suscepturus est, tunc ab alio dicuntur praefatae collectae et ipse (*scil.* sacerdos) ... per parlatorium ad ecclesiam redit, comitante armario ... postquam in ecclesiam venerint, unum de quotidianis calicibus in armario accipit vel ipse sacerdos vel armarius, prius tamen lotis manibus, et vinum et aquam ac si missa cantari inde deberet, infundit; tunc sacerdos ad maius altare super quod Corpus Domini servatur accedit, et priusquam accipiat incensat. Postmodum accipiens frangit super ipsum calicem et illam partem quam allaturus est super calicem tenet; aliam in pixide reponit et tunc ab armario tam manus sacerdotis quam ipse calix linteo mundissimo cooperiuntur. Si tunc conventus in choro est, quando discedit ab altari, totus veniam pro reverentia dominici Corporis petit; similiter ubicumque viderint eum fratres transeuntem faciunt. Interea curatur ut infirmi bucca lavetur recepturi ipsum dominicum Corpus. Priusquam accipiat, *Confiteor* dicit, et fratribus in commune respondentibus, *Misereatur vestri*, solus sacerdos prosequitur, *Indulgentiam et remissionem*, etc. Ipsum autem Domini Corpus in vino aqua mixto intinguitur, quo epotato ebibit quoque ablutionem calicis et, si potest, ablutionem digitorum sacerdotis et adhuc calicis; si non potest, alius ebibit. Adhibetur quoque ei crux," etc. (Quoted by Martène, *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* V. viii. 19.)

scribing for the communion of the sick no details of the rite are supplied.[1]

For the next century we may cite the *Customs of Citeaux*, and here we find that both kinds are separately administered in the mass,[2] while the one kind of Bread is used for the sick.[3] There does not appear to be any

[1] *Statuta*, c. 23: "quo facto, dictis collectis, quae sequuntur, vadat sacerdos praecedentibus duobus conversis cum candelabris, vadat [*scil.* ad ecclesiam pro sacramento] et tertius ad thuribulum deferendum, quibus revertentibus flexis genibus adorent omnes Corpus Domini, quod a sacerdote affertur; quo allato, abluto prius ore eius communicetur infirmus, nisi forte ipsa die communicatus sit." (*P.L.* cl. 509.)

[2] *Consuetudines* 53: "... sacerdos communicet diaconum et subdiaconum de tercia parte hostie, deinde de aliis hostiis ceteros qui communicaturi sunt. Provideat autem quantum poterit ne aliqua pars dominici Corporis remaneat. Diaconus ... convenienter aperto ore percipiat Corpus Domini. Quo percepto surgat et supplicet; similiter et subdiaconus. Quod postquam fecerit sumens fistulam si tunc necessaria est, eat ad sinistram partem per retro altare. Quod si tunc necessaria non fuerit sequatur diaconum. Qui diaconus veniens ante calicem inclinet et ad nutum sacerdotis accipiat illum, sumatque sanguinem eadem parte qua et sacerdos; nec tangat eam manu donec vino abluatur. Quod si unus vel duo tantum post eum communicaturi sunt, ministret eis Sanguinem eadem parte calicis qua ipse recepit, ita ut ipse dextra manu calicem tenens sinistram mento illorum subponat. ... Quod si plures fuerint, diaconus percepto Sanguine ibidem ponat calicem super sinistrum cornu altaris tenens illum, subdiacono sibi assistente atque adiuvante, hoc modo, scilicet ut dextram manum teneat expansam juxta labium calicis deforis, sinistra vero teneat pedem ipsius calicis. Diaconus autem teneat utraque manu in calice fistulam a subdiacono antea preparatam. Qui subdiaconus percipiat Sanguinem cum fistula priusquam se componat ad tenendum calicem eo modo quo diximus. Dum autem fratres percipiunt Sanguinem," etc. (Guignard, *Règle Cistercienne*, p. 148.)

Reception *sub utraque specie* at mass was limited by General Chapter (1198) to the sacred ministers: "diebus quoque quibus monachi communicaturi sunt, possunt ad missas privatas communicare vel ubi abbas decreverit faciendum; nulla tamen persona Ordinis nostri, exceptis ministris indutis sacris vestibus, ad sacrum calicem de caetero pro percipiendo Sanguine accedere praesumat, propter periculum et scandalum evitandum." (*Nomasticon Cisterc.* (Ant. Definit.), p. 406.)

[3] *Consuetudines* 93: "Quodsi statim communicari debuerit, eat cum ministris ad ecclesiam qui eum perunxit, aut alius pro eo si necesse fuerit. Et ablutis manibus in piscina deferat sacram Communionem cum calice offertorio cooperto, preeunte cruce, lumine, aqua benedicta. Alius etiam inter lumen et aquam deferat ampullam vinariam ad conspergendos digitos in calice. ... Sacerdos vero dicat ei, *Ecce frater Corpus Domini nostri Ihesu* XPI *quod tibi deferimus. Credis hoc esse illud in quo est salus vita et resurrectio nostra?* Quo respondente *Credo*, moneat eum dicere *Confiteor*

trace of the custom of steeping the Host in unconsecrated liquid, either for purely practical purposes or with the intention of hallowing the wine *e contactu hostiae*. A draught of ablutions twice repeated is prescribed as a sequel to communion.[1]

One or two liturgical points call for remark. There were in use formulae of administration in which precise statements as to the conjoint nature of the sacrament occur. Such, for example, are those given in documents from Milan and elsewhere. The rite *ad baptismum gravitalem* of the *Manuale Ambrosianum* (eleventh century) contains the form: "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, intincted with His Blood, preserve thy soul to life eternal."[2] Another MS. of similar provenance and approximately equal date enjoins the use of the same words at a sick communion.[3] A fuller form is prescribed in a Bobbio MS.: "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ anointed (and) intincted with His Blood cleanse thee from all sin and preserve thy soul to eternal life."[4] In none of these is there any indication, apparently, as to which sort of intinction is intended. In a twelfth-century monastic source from Rheinau, cited by

si monachus est. Quo dicto sacerdos cum his qui aderunt dicat, *Misereatur tui*; et postea solus subiungat *Indulgentiam et remissionem.* Deinde communicet eum dicens: *Corpus Domini nostri Ihesu* XPI *custodiat te in vitam aeternam.*" (Guignard, *op. cit.* p. 205.)

[1] *ibid.* 100: "Quando hospitalis viderit hospitem debere communicari, dicat priori. Qui provideat quis sacerdos hoc faciat, et qui cum eo eant. Sacerdos vero ablutis manibus indutus alba stola et manipulo, sumat partem dominici Corporis de vasculo in quo reservatur. Quam tenens super calicem, utraque manu offertorio cooperta, eat ad infirmum fratribus preeuntibus. . . . Cum autem venerint ad infirmum, inquirens fidem eius communicet eum sacerdos. Postea aspergat digitos suos vino in calice. Quod ministret ei tenens sinistram manum sub mento illius. Et iterum liniens calicem vino, det ei," etc. (*ibid.* pp. 217, 218.)

[2] "Corpus Domini nostri Ihesu Christi Sanguine suo tinctum conservet animam tuam in vitam aeternam. Amen." (*Mon. Vet. Liturg. Ambros.* pt. II. p. 473.) This formula occurs again in the eleventh-century *Sacramentary of Narbonne*, printed by Martène (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. art. 4, ordo 13).

[3] Cited by Sala in his edition of Bona (*Bonae Opera.* II. 18, § 3): "Communica eum et dic: *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Sanguine suo tinctum, conservet animam tuam in vitam aeternam.*"

[4] Cited by the same author (*loc. cit.*): "Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi Sanguine suo inlitum intinctam (*sic*) mundet te ab omni peccato et conservet animam tuam in vitam aeternam."

Gerbert, the Host has probably been reserved in an intincted state: "after unction of the invalid, let the priest wash his hands and bring forth the Body of the Lord, psalms being sung the while. Then the priest says the *Our Father*, etc., and two prayers; and after these have been said, let him communicate the sick man while the brethren stand. And before he communicates him, the priest shall say: The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ intincted with His Blood cleanse thee from all sin and preserve thy soul to eternal life."[1] Such forms as these could not of course survive the abolition of intinction.

More commonly the words of delivery used during this period take the form in which both species are named together as the subject of a singular verb. It is probable, as has been suggested elsewhere, that this type was originally devised to accompany delivery of the *Eucharistia intincta* in some shape. But it is evident that after the sufficiency of communion in one kind had been expressly stated, these forms were equally suitable to the administration of a non-intincted Host. For this reason they continued in use long after Intinction had become obsolete. Formulae of this type are, therefore, untrustworthy after a certain date for determining the actual mode of sick or other communion. If we are right in supposing them to have originated in connection with intinction, it is impossible to ascertain at what date words of delivery, that name both species together, ceased to correspond with actual practice. As we have seen, there was great variety of custom.

The *Missal of Robert of Jumièges* (early eleventh century) contains English rubrics in the communion of the sick, one of which has this sense: "Then let him taste of God's Body and Blood, thus saying"; but a prayer replaces the customary words of administration.[2] Somewhat later a *Pontifical of Salzburg* retains the usual "Gregorian" rubrics

[1] *Vetus Liturg.* p. 487: "Peruncto infirmo lavet sacerdos manus suas et educat Corpus Domini, dum canuntur psalmi. Postea dicit sacerdos *Pater noster*, etc., cum duabus orationibus. Hic finitis communicet infirmum stantibus fratribus. Et antequam communicet, dicat sacerdos: *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi intinctum Sanguine suo mundet ab omni peccato et conservet animam tuam in vitam aeternam.*"

[2] "Onbyrie þonne ʒodes lichoman 7 blodes þus cweðende: Domine, Sancte Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, te fideliter deprecamur," etc. (*Missal of Robert of Jumièges*: *H.B.S.* 1896, pp. lxxi, lxxii, and 294).

in the rite of clinical communion, and the words of delivery are still: "The Body and the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve (*custodiat*) thy soul," etc.;[1] and the early twelfth-century *Regula Clericorum* provides for the administration of "Christ's Body and Blood" as *viaticum*.[2] If it is probable that these examples (and many others could be given) illustrate the persistence of language originally associated with an obsolescent custom, there is no doubt about the fact in, *e.g.* the thirteenth-century *Ordines* of Fleury and Pontlevy.[3]

Early instances of forms that omit any mention of the sacred Blood are the monastic *ordo* of Moissac, which has merely the rubric, *Then let the Lord's Body be communicated*;[4] and the Cambrai Pontifical, probably of twelfth-century date, where the directions are: "Then let the priest communicate him, and let him say, The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul," etc.[5]

Here this part of our inquiry comes to an end. It is important to note again, in conclusion, that the factors

[1] "*Oratio ante perceptionem eucharistiae*: Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam. ℟. Amen. *Ac deinde*: Pax et communicatio Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam." (Mart., *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. 4, ordo 15.)

[2] Petrus de Honestis, *Reg. Cleric.* II. 22: "Quod si languor magis magisque increverit, per presbyteros aqua benedicta aspersi, oleo sancto perungantur et Christi Corporis et Sanguinis perceptione muniantur." (*P.L.* clxiii. 727.)

[3] *Ordo* of Fleury: "Expletis his orationibus, infirmus lavato ore accipiat Corpus Domini," followed by the prayer, "Domine Sancte . . . te suppliciter deprecamur pro infirmo accipiente eucharistiam sacrosancti Corporis et Sanguinis Filii tui," etc. (Martène, *op. cit.* I. vii. 4, ordo 23.) In the *Ordo* of Pontlevy (Martène, *u.s.* ordo 24) a similar prayer precedes the act of communion. The rubric, *Hic detur infirmo sacrificium ita dicendo*, recalls the language of the Bk. of Deer. Alternative forms are provided: "Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi," etc., and "Accipe viaticum Corporis et Sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui te custodiat ab hoste maligno et perducat ad vitam aeternam et resuscitet in novissimo die." The thanksgiving prayer that follows has "Celtic" affinities: "quem refecisti, Domine, coelesti mysterio Corporis et Sanguinis Jesu Christi," etc.

[4] "Benedictio ab uno sacerdote dicenda: Tunc communicetur Corpus Domini. Benedicat te Deus Pater," etc. (Martène, *u.s.* ordo 11.)

[5] "Tunc communicat eum sacerdos et dicat: Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam," etc. The two elements are named in the following prayer. (Mart., *u.s.* ordo 19.)

which led to the withholding from the laity of their ancient privilege of receiving communion under both species at the mass, brought about the resumption of primitive custom in the communion of the sick. The intincted Host was no longer employed: the Bread alone, as in early times, sufficed. The only form of Intinction that still lingered a little while was that simple and primitive variety, of which the sole purpose was to facilitate deglutition;[1] and before long this expedient was replaced by the practice of administering a draught of unconsecrated liquid after communion to ensure the total consumption of the Host.[2]

[1] On which Giraldus Cambrensis has the following note (*Gemma Ecclesiast.* I. 9): "Nullus panem intinctum accipiat excepto sacerdote consecrante (*i.e.* at the commixture) et excepto infirmo, qui propter ariditatem aliter nequeat deglutire. Et nota quamvis viaticum in specie panis pro infirmis servetur, non tamen in specie vini, tum quia cito corrumpitur, tum quia cito effunditur, tum etiam quia sub una specie utrumque accipitur." (*R.S.* 21. II. p. 29.)

[2] Not only, of course, in connection with clinical communion. Archbishop Peckham (*Constitutiones*) refers to the use of a draught of wine after communion at mass, which became the general custom (*purificatio oris*): "Attendant insuper sacerdotes quod cum Communionem sacram porrigunt simplicibus Paschali tempore vel alio, sollicite eos instruant sub panis specie simul eis dari Corpus et Sanguinem Domini, immo Christum integrum vivum et verum qui totus est sub specie Sacramenti. Doceant eosdem, quod id quod eisdem in calice propinatur, non est Sacramentum, sed vinum purum eis hauriendum traditum, ut facilius sacrum Corpus glutiant quod ceperunt. Solis enim celebrantibus Sanguinem sub specie vini consecrati sumere in hujus modi minoribus ecclesiis est concessum." (*P.L.* clxxxvi. 1056.) Contrast with this the canon issued by the Synod of Durham (*c.* 1220), in which the laity are expected to communicate from the chalice. (Wilkins, *op. cit.* I. 578.)

Without digressing too far from the point in question, we may remark that the *Rule of St. Benedict* had already provided for the "*purificatio oris*" after communicating: "Frater autem lector hebdomadarius accipiat mixtum prius quam incipiat legere, propter Communionem sanctam et ne forte grave sit ei jejunium sustinere." (*c.* 38.) *Mixtum* is a draught of wine and water or a portion of bread and wine (cf. *c.* 35), allowed to the reader, not only lest his task should prove too fatiguing if undertaken fasting, but also to prevent any unintentional irreverence after reception of the Eucharist. cf. *Regula Magistri* (seventh century) xxiv.: "Ipse suum merum propter sputum Sacramenti accipiat et tunc incipiat legere." (*P.L.* lxxxviii. 992.)

CHAPTER XI

Communion in the Sole Species of Wine

THE adequacy of sacramental communion in the single species of Wine is asserted in every careful statement made in the interest of the developed mediaeval theory of concomitance.[1] But here again, as in the separate use of the eucharistic Bread, ancient custom had anticipated the conclusions of the Schoolmen. From early times the sacrament was thus administered to infants; and there are scattered allusions also to the occasional use of this method in communicating sick or unconscious adults.

For infant communion in this fashion in the third century we have the testimony of St. Cyprian. He tells of a little child who, after having been made to partake of an idolatrous sacrifice, refused the chalice at the Liturgy.[2] His description of the incident suggests that it was then customary for infants to receive the eucharistic Wine in the open communion at the same time that their parents communicated after the usual manner. St. Augustine, who appears on the whole to have held the view that communion is generally necessary to the salvation of infants, alludes to reception of the Eucharist in this one, as well as in both kinds, immediately after Baptism.[3] It does not appear from

[1] See notes to chap. x.

[2] *de lapsis* 25: "ubi vero sollemnibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre praesentibus coepit et accipientibus ceteris locus eius advenit, faciem suam parvula instinctu divinae maiestatis avertere, os labiis obdurantibus premere, calicem recusare. Perstitit tamen diaconus et reluctanti licet de sacramento calicis infudit. Tunc sequitur singultus et vomitus. In corpore atque ore violato eucharistia permanere non potuit, sanctificatus in Domini Sanguine potus de pollutis visceribus erupit." (Hartel iii. p. 255.)

cf. also *Ep.* (63) *ad Caecil*, 8: "per baptisma Spiritus Sanctus accipitur, et sic baptizatis et Spiritum Sanctum consecutis ad bibendum calicem Domini pervenitur." (Hartel iii. p. 707.)

[3] *Contra Julian* op. imperf. ii. c. 30 (*P.L.* xlv. 1154); *Serm.* clxxiv. 6 (*P.L.* xxxviii. 944).

Contra duas epistol. pelagian. I. 22. (*P.L.* xliv. 570.)

his works that communion was ever repeated during infancy;[1] nor was this ever the early custom anywhere.[1]

According to the interpretation of the canon of Toledo xi (A.D. 675) adopted in the text of this work, the actual use of the single species of Wine is not there intended,[2] but the use of an accompanying draught from the chalice was likely to lead on to the employment of the Wine alone for the communion of those who were unable to swallow the Host, especially in areas where intinction in any form was regarded with disapproval. Some writers have seen a reference to sole administration of the Wine in another canon dealing with clinical communion, the date and origin of which are not certainly known. It is, however, doubtful whether this is the sense of the injunction to "pour the Eucharist into the mouth"[3] of an unconscious penitent.

The *Gelasian Sacramentary*[4] and the early forms of the "Gregorian" Service books[5] provide for the communion of babes after their initiation, but do not seem to contemplate the use of the Wine by itself for this purpose. Perhaps the growing fashion of intinction may account for this.[6]

Familiarity with infant or sick communion in the liquid species seems to explain what is narrated, in the ninth-century *Life of St. Anskar of Bremen*, of a certain woman named Fridburga, who lived far from a church, and in view of her death devised a makeshift for *viaticum*.

[1] *Epist.* (217) *ad Vital. pelag.* (*P.L.* xxxiii. 984.) [2] See p. 122.

[3] It contains the phrase "*infundatur* ori eius eucharistia." See pp. 144, 145.

Contrast *Can.* 31 of Ælfric's *Canons*: "They will give the housel to the sick if they are able to swallow, but not to a man who is half dead, for Christ meant that men should eat it as food." (Thorpe, *op. cit.* p. 446.)

[4] *Sacr. Gelas.* I. 75: "postea, si fuerit oblata, agendae sunt missae, et communicat; sin autem, dabis ei tantum sacramenta Corporis et Sanguinis Christi, dicens: *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi sit tibi in vitam aeternam.*" (Wilson, p. 117.) The infant is here baptized in sickness.

[5] *e.g.* in the appendices to Muratori's *Sacramentum Gregorian*, where immediately after baptism and chrism follows: "et vestitur infans vestimentis suis. Si vero episcopus adest, statim confirmari eum oportet chrismati, et postea communicare. Et si episcopus deest, communicetur a presbytero, dicente ita: *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam. Amen.*" This takes place on Easter Even. (Muratori, *Lit. Rom. Vet.* ii. 158.)

[6] There is of course abundant evidence that infants were frequently communicated in both kinds. See, for a discussion of this question, *D.C.A.* I. pp. 835 ff. *s.v.* Infant Communion; Hergenröther u. Kaulen, *Kirchenlexicon* vii. 460 f. *s.v.* Kindercommunion.

"Out of her affection for the sacrifice," so the story tells, "which she had heard was the *viaticum* of Christian folk, she caused a little wine to be set aside in a phial. This she entrusted to her daughter to the intent that whenever her last hour should come some of this wine might be poured into her mouth—for she lacked the sacrifice—and that thus she might commend her passing to the grace of the Lord. And she kept this wine by her for the space of nearly three years."[1] In the end, we are told, she received the last communion in the normal way at the hands of a priest.

Passing on to the twelfth century, when concomitance was much to the fore, we find that a writer of the period, Robert Paululus, speaking of newly-baptized children, remarks: "If they are able to do so, they should receive the sacrament of unity, that is, the Body and Blood of Christ; but to infants lately born, the same sacrament is to be administered in the species of the Blood by means of the priest's finger, because they can suck naturally."[2] He disapproves of the practice by which common wine was substituted for the consecrated species; and adds, "that if, in reserving the Blood of Christ, or in administering it to the children, any risk is involved, it seems better that the custom should be discontinued."[3] Pope Paschal II, in his letter to the

[1] *Vita S. Anscharii.* 32: "Ipsa amore Sacrificii quod audierat viaticum esse Christianorum, de vino aliquantulum in quodam fecit reservari vasculo: et filiae suae in fide commendans ut siquando ei ultimum tempus instaret, de ipso vino, quia sacrificium non habebat, ei in os distillaretur, ut sic Domini gratiae exitum suum commendaret: illud itaque vinum tribus fere annis apud eam conservatum est." (*P.L.* cxviii. 982.)

[2] *de Caerimoniis* I. 20: "Si ejus valetudinis est, sacramenta unitatis, id est, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi accipere debent. Pueris recens natis idem sacramentum in specie Sanguinis est ministrandum digito sacerdotis, quia tales naturaliter sugere possunt." (*P.L.* clxxvii. 392.) This treatise is included among the works of Hugo of St. Victor. A leaf is allowed as a substitute for the finger by the rubric giving directions for infant Communion in the Pontifical of the Latin Church at Apamea: "Communicantur pueri qui nondum noverunt comedere vel bibere sive cum folio sive cum digito intincto in Sanguine Domini et posito in ore ipsorum, sacerdote ita dicente: *Corpus cum Sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam. Amen.*" (Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. i. art. 18, ordo 15.)

[3] *ibid.*: "unde ignorantia presbytorum adhuc formam retenens sed non rem dat eis loco Sanguinis vinum, quod penitus supervacuum arbitrarer, si sine scandalo simplicium dimitti potest. Si autem in reservando Sanguinem Christi vel in ministrando pueris immineat periculum potius supersedendum videtur." (*P.L.* clxxvii. 392 *ut s.*)

Abbot of Cluny in the same century, permits the use of the eucharistic Wine alone in communicating infants and adults in the extremity of sickness, forbidding at the same time the employment in such cases of the intincted Host;[1] and other authorities of this age might be quoted as favouring the same expedient.[2]

Ultimately, as part of the discipline by which communion in the chalice was altogether withdrawn from the laity, the practice disappeared in the West. It was superseded locally by the custom to which Paululus alludes, in which a drop of unconsecrated wine was administered in a similar fashion immediately after Baptism.[3]

As for the East, the peculiar form of intinction there commonly in use allows conjoint delivery of both species to an infant. But Goar remarks that in his day, "in practice, although the rule is otherwise, the Eucharist is given to infants under the species of Wine alone."[4] Apart from this statement no precise information seems to have been recorded concerning the genuine use in the Orthodox churches of the species of the chalice *pro complemento communionis.* According to Gabriel the Sionite, the separated bodies, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, and Maronites, were accustomed to use the Wine alone for infant communion.[5]

[1] See above, p. 170.

[2] *e.g.* William de Champeaux (*de Sacrament. Altaris*): ". . . infantulis mox baptizatis solus calix datur, quia pane uti non possunt, et in calice totum Christum accipiunt." (*P.L.* clxiii. 1039.) For adults, Robert Pullen (*Sentent.* viii. 3): "dubiumque non est quin si cui, ut facilius insumatur, pervalde infirmo Sanguis infunditur, satisfactum sit communioni." (*P.L.* clxxxvi. 963.)

[3] Traces of infant communion in the sole species of Wine lasted long. According to Hergenröther u. Kaulen (*Kirchenlexicon.* vii. 462), a Manual of Amiens, dated 1524, orders the administration of common wine to newly-baptized infants, the delivery to be accompanied by the formula: "Corpus et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam." Thalhofer (*Handbuch der Kathol. Liturg.* I. p. 289) quotes, as seventeenth-century custom at Cologne, the following: "Praemissis omnibus ad baptisterium rite peractis, sacerdos procedat ad altare, et si baptizatus est adultus communicet; sin infans, ponat sacerdos de vino in os ejus, dicens: *N. hujus vini perceptio sit tibi in salutem aeternam corporis et animae.*"

[4] Cited by *D.C.A.* I. 837: "*Annot.* Nihusii ad Allatii Dissert. *de Missa Praesanct.* ad fin; (Allat. *de occ. et or. consent.* col. 1659)."

[5] *D.C.A. u.s.*

Early custom and later doctrine agree in witness to the belief that, when circumstances make it necessary to administer the Eucharist thus to those who are unable to receive it in any other manner, the use of the consecrated Wine secures the full benefit of sacramental communion. It was necessary to produce some evidence for this belief before asking the question, whether the Eucharist was ever reserved in this form.

Reservation of the Wine is undoubtedly associated with two occasions.

1. In the earliest known form of the "Presanctified," provided for those who wished to communicate on non-liturgical days, we have seen that both elements were used separately. They must therefore have been separately reserved until the customs of "sacramental," and later, of "consecratory," intinction paved the way for the entire omission of the second species from this rite.[1] But reservation in connection with this service would not at any time be a continuous affair. Moreover, before the use of the Wine disappeared in the West from the "Presanctified," it was, at last, reserved only from the mass of Maundy Thursday until the following morning; while, with the adoption of intinction among the Easterns, the separate reservation of the Wine for use in communion on non-liturgical days became obsolete in that part of the Church also.

2. In order to communicate those who were baptized on Easter Even, it was customary at Constantinople in the fourth century to set aside at the Liturgy on Maundy Thursday a supply of the two sacred elements for this purpose. This we learn from St. John Chrysostom;[2] and there is no reason to suppose that this practice was confined to that one area of Christendom. The existence of altars in the baptisteries of basilicas, where these were situated at some distance from the main building, points to the close connection which was at one time universally recognized between baptism and first communion. It is very probable that altars in this position served at seasons of public baptism as suitable places from which distribution of the Eucharist might take place.[3]

Still, chiefly in association with Baptism, we find injunctions or permissions issued in the twelfth century regarding the use of the single species of Wine for communicating infants and others; and the question arises whether it was constantly reserved for this purpose. Paululus certainly warns priests against incurring the risk of accident to the chalice by attempting to reserve. Judging from the context, this reservation must be allowed to mean more than a mere delay of the ablutions until after opportunity had been given for any newly-christened infant present at the mass to be communicated in the Wine hallowed in the service.[1] The contents of the chalice are evidently supposed to be kept for some space of time. But in the absence of more precise information than we at present seem to possess, it is impossible to argue that there was ever in vogue a constant and regular custom of reserving the eucharistic Wine separately for the communion of infants.[2]

As for the reservation of the Wine for the sick, in previous chapters we have discussed the one or two passages that are capable of being interpreted to imply the existence of such a practice. We have found that they do not furnish trustworthy evidence on this point, and are, in fact, satisfactorily explained as containing no allusion to the supposed custom.[3]

[1] See chap. vii.

[2] *Epist. ad Innocent. Papam* 33. See p. 108.

[3] See chap. xiii.

[1] See above, p. 178.

[2] Several mediaeval writers who handled the point of sick communion insisted (*inter alia*) upon the imminent risk of corruption in reserving the Wine. *e.g.* Giraldus Cambrensis (as already quoted) in *Gemma Ecclesiast.* I. 9: "Et nota quod quamvis viaticum in specie panis pro infirmis servetur, non tamen in specie vini, tum quia cito corrumpitur, tum quia cito effunditur tum etiam quia sub una specie utrumque accipitur." (*R.S.* xxii. 2, p. 29.)

[3] It is, perhaps, worth while to call attention to the fact that in northern latitudes, where wine was scarce, curious expedients were sometimes employed in order to secure a supply of the matter of the Sacrament. These forms of reservation, so to say, of *un*consecrated wine were marked for condemnation by authority. The false decree of Pope Julius forbade the practice of soaking a linen cloth in wine and keeping it in a dried state for infusion into water to provide the matter of the chalice. Pope Alexander III admonishes the Scandinavian hierarchy, through the Archbishop of Upsala, that on no account shall they allow the use of dried-up remains of wine, or of particles of bread steeped in wine and dried, or any other such shift, in preparing the sacramental Cup: ". . . apostolica prohibemus auctoritate ut cum sicca faece vini, vel cum micis panis vino intinctis vel alio modo quam dominus instituit nullus de cetero sacrificare attentet. . . ." *Epist.* (in append. 23) *ad Upsellen. archiep.* (Hard. vi. 2. 1446.)

CHAPTER XII

Renewal of the Reserved Eucharist

FROM the beginning it must, of course, have been apparent that to keep the sacrament—in whatever form reserved—for an indefinite length of time was to expose it to the peril of corruption and to other accidents. But for six centuries we meet with no trace of legislation on this subject. The first definite injunction known concerning the renewal of the reserved Eucharist appears in the East. A series of canons issued by St. Sahak (Isaac III), a seventh-century Catholicos of Armenia, dealt, *inter alia*, with the custom of reserving the Eucharist for a year or even longer, and enjoined that the sacrament should be kept "only from Lord's Day to Lord's Day, or from sacrifice to sacrifice," and not for any longer period. The Bread alone is named, and we may suppose that the species reserved throughout the year was hallowed, as it is to-day in the Greek Church, on Maundy Thursday. The canon makes provision for a certain diversity of custom in the same area, with the celebration of the Liturgy every Sunday, prescribed probably as a desirable minimum.[1]

It was also the frequency of celebration that largely determined the period of reservation in the West, in places where the same minimum of a weekly Sunday mass was commonly observed.[2] We do not, however, find in the earliest allusions to the matter any direct reference to a

[1] Q.: "Utrum liceat panem oblatum consecratum ac in Corpus Dei conversum anno integro in tabernaculo conservare, uti aliqui solent, vel etiam ultra annum; necne?" R.: "Minime licet, nisi a die dominica ad dominicam, vel a sacrificio ad sacrificium, non autem diutius." (Translation in Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* x. p. 301.)

[2] For weekly celebration see Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, pp. 335 ff. It is unusual to find a fortnightly celebration ordered as the minimum, but this occurs in the *Statuta Synodalia* of Reims, *e.g.*: "Sacrosanctam eucharistiam sacerdos celebraturus se praeparet et probet: et ut minimum bis in mense id faciat." For source and date of this canon, see Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* III. 1. p. 264.

fixed interval after which renewal of the sacrament should take place.

An early collection of graduated penalties attaching to neglect of the sacrament is found in the second part of the *Rule of St. Columban*. Penances of increasing severity are allotted according as the Host is discovered to have undergone any change of colour, to be partially corrupt, or entirely dried up (*siccetur*) and perished.[1] But it is not clear from the text whether it is the sacrament officially reserved for general use that is here in question, or that which was borne privately upon the person. It is probable that the latter use of the sacrament is the one that is contemplated, because the contents of Columban's *Rule* are not original, but represent the usage of the Celtic Churches, and the absence of allusion to any stated time after which renewal is necessary is explained if these penalties relate to the private habit.[2]

From the *Rule of St. Columban*, and from the sources that lie behind it, regulations of this character passed into the later penitentials, which have therefore on this point as on others a certain Celtic savour.[3]

Allusion to the loss of the natural features of the consecrated species is frequent in literature of this sort, and the test of change in colour has been used as an argument for the conjoint reservation of the two kinds at this time;[4] while the use of the phrase *siccetur* in Columban's *Rule* has been quoted as affording additional evidence for the supposition that the Host was intincted for reservation. It is

[1] c. 10: "qui negligentiam fecerit erga sacrificium ut siccetur et a vermibus consumatur ita ut ad nihilum devenerit, dimidio anno poenitent. Qui negligentiam erga sacrificium incurrerit ut inveniatur vermis in eo, et tamen plenum sit, igne comburat juxta altare et abscondat cinerem eius intra sub altare, et ipse poeniteat quadraginta diebus. Qui negligit sacrificium et immutatum fuerit et panis amiserit saporem, si rubro colore, viginti dies poeniteat, si hyacinthino, quindecim dies poeniteat. Si autem non immutatum fuerit colore sed conglutinatum, septem dies poeniteat." (*P.L.* lxxx. p. 222.) Notice that the reddish colour is taken to be a mark of corruption, and cannot therefore refer to the presence of the species of wine. cf. also *de Mensura Poenitentiae* 13 (*P.L.* lxxxvii. 996).

[2] See chap. v.

[3] The penances, at first in the form of fastings and abstinences, are commuted to money payments in later Penitentials, *e.g. Leges Presbyter. Northumbr.* (tenth century), in Liebermann, *Geietze der A.S.*, i. 380.

[4] *e.g.* by Warren, *Liturgy of Celtic Church*, p. 139.

a fact that these tests are applied more particularly during a period when conjoint administration was probably in use; but on the other hand we have strong grounds for belief that in Columban's circle, at any rate, the eucharistic Bread alone was used at clinical communion.[1]

In the original portion of the *Penitential of Theodore*, a seventh-century document, it is directed that the Host which has become corrupt through overlong keeping shall be burnt;[2] and that the reference is still primarily to the Eucharist privately borne is clear from another injunction in the same series: "Whosoever loses the sacrifice, and it be eaten by beast or fowl," shall do suitable penance.[3] In the eighth-century *Penitential* that bears the name of Egbert we have similar regulations, with additions which include the injunction (also in Columban) that the incinerated Hosts are to be buried near the altar.[4] Still there is no stated time for renewal.[5]

In the extract preserved by Regino—possibly a canon

[1] See chap. ix, p. 129.

[2] *Poenitent. Theodori* XII.: "De communione eucharistiae vel sacrificio . . . 6. omne sacrificium sordida vetustate corruptum igni comburendum est." (Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* III. p. 187.)

[3] *ibid.* 8: "qui sacrificium perdit feris vel avibus devorandum, si casu, ebdomadas jejunet, si neglegens, III. xlmas. (*ibid.*) These two injunctions are part of the original work, drawn up, probably under Theodore's eye, by the Discipulus Umbrensium. (See Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* III. pp. 173 ff.)

[4] *Poenit. Egberti* XII. "*de eucharistia*: 1. Si quis eucharistiam negligentiae causa perdiderit, unum annum vel III. quadragissimas seu XL. dies peniteat. 2. Si sacrificium in terra ceciderit causa negligentiae L. psalmos cantet. 3. Qui neglexerit sacrificium, ut vermes in eo sint vel colorem non habet saporemque, XX. vel XXX. vel XL. diebus peniteat et in igne accendatur, cinis eius sub altare abscondatur. 4. Si usque ad terram ceciderit, unum diem peniteat. 5. Qui in ecclesia modicam partem perdiderit et non invenit, XX. diebus peniteat, vel unoquoque die psalmos LXX. cantet. 6. Quis autem in plebe suum crismal perdiderit et non invenit, XL. dies peniteat, vel III. quadragissimas peniteat." (Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* III. pp. 427, 428.) Some of these injunctions evidently contemplate accidents at Mass, as well as loss of or accident to the Eucharist privately reserved. They appear again in such documents as the *Judicia* ascribed to Gregory III. (Hard. iii. 1876.)

[5] "de eucharistia inveterata per quinquaginta dies" is the title of a section (54) in the sixty capitula communicated to Petit (Paris, 1677) by Nicholas Favier, reproduced as part of Theodore's *Penitential* by Migne (*P.L.* xcix. 951, 952). These capitula are of later date, and range down as far as the tenth century. (Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* III. pp. 174, 175.)

of some ninth-century Council of Tours—three days are appointed as the term after which the Host must be renewed;[1] and here the mention of a definite term, together with the injunction that the sacrament must be kept securely locked up on account of mice and the designs of wicked persons, show that the Eucharist reserved in the church is in question.

Generally speaking, from some time in the ninth century onward, the renewal usually took place once a week at the Sunday mass.[2] So it was ordered by the Council of Lanciano (Ansanum) in A.D. 990: "The Body of the Lord shall not be reserved in the church for longer than eight days, and shall be always renewed on the Sunday."[3] Nearly a hundred years later a Council of Rouen (1072) remarked that there were priests who kept the *viaticum* and holy water beyond the eighth day, and condemned the practice.[4]

There is evidence for the local existence of a curious custom in England during the tenth century. Peculiar sanctity was attached to the Eucharist hallowed on Easter Day, and a portion was sometimes reserved through the year for the needs of the sick. This habit is forbidden in the *Canons of Ælfric* (1003). The old English text is given

[1] *Notitiae.* I. 71: "(oblatio) semperque sit super altare obseratum propter mures et nefarios homines, et de tertio in tertium diem semper mutetur."

[2] Martène notes several exceptions to the rule of weekly renewal of the Eucharist. During the eleventh century at Limoges, in parish as well as in monastic churches, it was customary to reserve for the month by papal permission: "Consuetudo est apud Lemovicenses propter auctoritatem Clementis papae de diligentia Corporis Domini ut non solum per monasteria, sed etiam per omnes ecclesias Primatis Lemovicensis, ne vetustate inveniatur aliqua putredo in *fragmentis* dominici Corporis, renovetur Corpus Domini per duodecim terminos in anno, et vetus quod mutatur non nisi a clericis nostris sumatur." (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* l. 5. art. 3, 9.)

The custom at one time among the Carthusians was to renew the Eucharist every month; at another once a fortnight. (Martène, *De Ant. Mon. Rit.* II. 4.)

[3] *Can.* 2: "nunquam autem servetur Corpus dominicum in ecclesia amplius quam diebus octo, et semper renovetur in die dominico." (Martène and Durand, *Thesaur. Anecdot.* iv. 75.)

[4] *Can.* 6: "Item, sunt quidam qui viaticum et aquam benedictam ultra octavum diem reservant; quod et damnatum est. Alii vero non habentes hostias, consecratas iterum consecrant: quod terribiliter interdictum est."

by Thorpe, and translated thus: "Some priests hold the housel, that was hallowed on Easter Day, for sick people; but they misdo very deeply, that the holy housel should become mouldy, and will not understand how great a penance the penitential enjoins if the housel be mouldy or discoloured, or if it be lost, or if mice or beasts eat it through negligence. The holy housel should be kept with great care and not be retained; but other new be hallowed for sick men, always every seven days or fortnight, that it may not at least be mouldy: because the housel that was hallowed to-day is just as holy as that which was hallowed on Easter Day."[1]

A Council held at Westminster under the Papal Legate in 1138 prescribes a week as the lawful period;[2] and in the decrees of a Synod of York, a few years later (1195), occurs an injunction of similar import: "Let care be taken that the Host be kept in a pyx, clean and fair; and that it be renewed every Lord's Day."[3] At approximately the same date (1198) a Synod of Paris, presided over by Bishop Odo (Eudes de Sully), decreed that every eighth day the priests of the province were to renew the water of the font and the Holy Eucharist, lest neglect of these duties might be the cause of any impiety or misapprehension.[4]

Another Council of Westminster (1200) drew attention to the point that when the sacrament was renewed on Sunday, the priest should make sure that a consecrated Host was employed for reservation, and take care to avoid the accident of substituting an unconsecrated wafer by mistake.[5]

It is natural to find regulations on the subject of the material of the Eucharist frequent at this time; at the

[1] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, p. 449.

[2] *Can.* 2: "Sancimus etiam ut ultra octo dies Corpus Christi non reservetur. . . ." (Hard. vi. 2. 1204.)

[3] *Cap.* 1: ". . . provideatur etiam ut in pyxide munda et honesta hostia reservetur, singulisque dominicis diebus renovetur. . . ." (Hard. vi. 2. 1930.)

[4] *praescr.* 21: "Sacerdotes die octavo semper renovent sacramenta ad fontem benedictum oleo et chrismate, et sanctam eucharistiam, ne vetustate aliqui ad indevotionem moveri valeant aut errorem." (Hard. vi. 2. 1943.)

[5] *decr.* 2: ". . . renovetur quoque hostia ipsa singulis dominicis diebus, habeaturque certitudo circa ipsam eucharistiam ita quod non sumat non consecratam pro consecrata. . . ." (Hard. vi. 2. 1957.)

period, that is, when the general acceptance of Transubstantiation was making for the recognition of this theory as a dogma of the faith at the Lateran Council of 1215.

From Udalric's descriptions of the customs at Cluny[1] in the eleventh century we learn how and when the weekly renewal of the Eucharist took place there. On Sundays, after Terce and before the Chapter mass began, the deacon took down the dove that used to hang constantly above the altar, and removed from the body of the dove the little cork pyx that contained the Host, dusted it, and placed it on the right side of the altar, under the covering cloth. At the Pax he took out the Host reserved from the previous Sunday, from which the brethren were forthwith communicated; and placed a newly-consecrated wafer in the pyx, which, after mass was done, was restored to the pendent dove.[2] The earlier version of the Cluniac *Consuetudines*, written by Bernard, assert that the Host for reservation was wrapped in linen, and so laid in the dove.[3]

[1] *Antiquiores Consuet. Cluniacen. Monast.* II. 30: "Sciendum quoque quoniam omni die dominica Corpus Domini mutatur; et dum sacerdos procedit ad pacem, recens consecratum a diacono in pixide cortica reponitur: et quod praeterita dominica consecratum fuerat, inde accipitur et ab eodem diacono dividitur, et patres inde communicantur; duae tantum particulae illius hostiae quam sacerdos dividit non mutantur. Praedictam autem pixidem, dum psalmi familiares post tertiam dicuntur, diaconus de columba jugiter pendente super altare bene cum linteolo de pulvere exterius tersa abstrahit et super dextrum cornu sub coopertorio ponit, missaque finita in eodem loco reponit." (D'Achery, *Spic.* I. p. 679.)

[2] Further information of this kind is given by Martène, who prints several extracts from monastic customs of various dates (*De Ant. Mon. Rit.* II. 4).

The Cistercian *Consuetudines* (early twelfth century) contain no very clear directions for renewal of the Host. All that is there prescribed on this point is: "Sacerdos autem antequam recipiat calicem si que hostie integre superfuerint communicatis reponat in vasculo." (Guignard, p. 149.)

[3] Ducange, *Glossar. s.v.* Columba.

CHAPTER XIII

The Place of Reservation

A. The Sacristy

FROM the few passages of early date that allude to the custody (temporary or constant) of the reserved Eucharist, it appears that the sacristy was the place in which the sacrament was originally kept. In the fourth-century *Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions*, the deacons are ordered to remove what remains of the consecrated species after the communion, and to deposit them in the *pastophoria*, *i.e.* the sacristies that were built on either side of the apse.[1] It was here that the elements were prepared for the Liturgy, and hither it would be natural to return with any portion of the hallowed species that remained, whether by intention or by accident, unconsumed. The cupboards and presses with which the sacristy was furnished provided suitable places of safe-keeping for the Eucharist as for other sacred things. Hence the statement mistakenly attributed to St. Jerome that "the sacristy in which is laid the Body of Christ, Who is the true Bridegroom of the Church and of our souls, is well called the bridal chamber or *pastophorium*."[2] We have already considered the possible reference to this use of the sacristy that is to be found in a letter of St. Paulinus of Nola.[3] We have seen reason to suppose that in Africa the Eucharist was reserved in this

[1] "καὶ ὅταν πάντες μεταλάβωσι καὶ πᾶσαι, λαβόντες οἱ διάκονοι τὰ περισσεύσαντα εἰσφερέτωσαν εἰς τὰ παστοφόρια." (Brightman, *Liturgies*, I. p. 25.)

[2] "Quare sacrarium in quo jacet Corpus Christi qui verus est Ecclesiae et animarum nostrarum sponsus, proprie thalamus seu παστοφόριον appellatur." The term παστοφόριον has many meanings in both pagan and Christian literature; and in this passage it is rightly traced back to παστός, of which the primary sense is an inner room, and hence a bridal chamber. For ref. see p. 109.

[3] *Epist.* (32) *ad Severum.* See p. 110.

part of the basilica at the time of Optatus.[1] In Gaul the Council of Mâcon (A.D. 585) ordered that whatever remained of the eucharistic Bread should be kept in the sacristy, whither children were to be brought on Wednesdays and Fridays in order to consume it.[2] At about the same date and in the same area it is from the sacristy where they had been reserved that the *Sancta* were carried in the *turris* to the altar.[3] In the early years of the eighth century the *Missale Francorum* contains a possible allusion to reservation in the sacristy; the episcopal address to the subdeacon at his ordination warns him against preparing a greater quantity of obleys than would be needed for the communion, "lest any should remain corrupt in the *sacrarium*."[4] This is not, of course, to be understood as forbidding reservation; it merely requires that excess should be avoided.

In England we are told that one of the names for the sacristy was "*husel portic*" (*i.e.* "eucharistiae porticus"),[5] which suggests that early custom in this country agreed with that which prevailed at the same period in Gaul.

At Rome, in the ninth century, the *Sancta* were brought to the Pope at the introit, and as much as was not required for the ceremony was replaced in the *conditorium*,[6] and this may have been in the sacristy.[7]

[1] *De schism: Donat.* II. 19. See p. 111.

[2] *Can.* 6: ". . . Quaecumque reliquiae sacrificiorum post peractam missam in sacrario supersederint," etc. See p. 115.

[3] St. German, *Expositio.* (*P.L.* lxxii. 93); Gregory of Tours, *De Gloria Mart.* 86. (*P.L.* lxxi. 781.) See pp. 77, 78.

[4] "de ipsis oblationibus tantum debet esse in altario poni quantum populo possit sufficere, ne aliquid putridum in sacrario maneat." (*P.L.* lxxii. 319.)

[5] Bridgett, *op. cit.*, p. 168. But the lines of Æthelwolf in his poem about Lindisfarne Abbey Church suggest a different explanation of this name. He speaks of the *porticus in medio* [altaris], that is, the vaulted dome above the altar; and in the next line of the pyx containing the *pretiosae munera vitae* (*P.L.* xcvi. 1337). *Husel portic* may therefore be the dome over the altar from which the pyx was (?) suspended, somewhat after the manner of later times.

[6] Atchley, *Ordo Roman. Primus*, p. 128.

[7] In 1512 Spanish bishops sitting in council at Seville published the following: "Ordinamus ut in omnibus ecclesiis . . . adsit sacrarium ac loca bene constructa et ornata cum bonis seris et clavibus in quibus reponantur S. Sacramentum, oleum ac chrisma. . . . Jubeantque pariter

B. AN AUMBRY IN THE CHURCH

As more attention came to be bestowed upon the "matter" of the sacrament there was a tendency to regard the sacristy no longer as a suitable place for reservation. A locker or cupboard was constructed in the walls or pillars of the sanctuary, or in the reredos behind the altar. It was in such a place, it would seem, that the Eucharist was kept in some French churches in the twelfth century. Among the canons and injunctions issued (about the year 1198) by Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris, is one that bids reverence be paid to the altars, and particularly to that whereat the Host is reserved or mass is being said.[1] That no reference is made to any custom of reserving in a standing receptacle placed upon the holy table is clear from the language of another injunction in the same series, which orders the Body of the Lord to be kept with all care under lock and key in the fairest part of the altar.[2] We are to understand that an aumbry made in some mural structure behind the altar is intended. This was called the *tabernaculum* according to a third injunction, and in it was placed the ivory pyx containing the Eucharist.[3]

The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) insisted upon the safe custody of the reserved sacrament;[4] and that the canon issued on this point contemplates the use of an aumbry for the purpose is fairly certain. If we go a little beyond the limits of the period covered by this work we have the *Constitutions* of Archbishop Peckham (1281) for a commentary upon the canon of the Lateran. He ordered

ut die noctuque ardeat lampas coram dicto loco et sacrario. . . ." (Cited by Ducange, *Glossar.* s.v. Sacrarium.) But this seems to have been a locker.

[1] *Cap.* v. 1: "summa reverentia et honor maximus sacris altaribus exhibeatur et maxime ubi sacrosanctum Corpus Domini reservatur et missa celebratur." (Hard. vi. pt. 2. 1939.)

[2] *Cap.* v. 7: "in pulchriori parte altaris cum summa diligentia et honestate sub clave sacrosanctum Corpus Domini custodiatur." (*u.s.*)

[3] *Praec.* 35: ". . . ita sunt negligentes quod nondum habent pyxidem eburneam nec tabernaculum ubi reservetur cum honore Corpu Domini. . . ." (Hard. *u.s.* 1944.)

[4] *Can.* 20: "Statuimus ut in cunctis ecclesiis chrisma et eucharistia sub fideli custodia clavibus adhibitis conserventur: ne possit ad illa temeraria manus extendi ad aliqua horribilia vel nefaria exercenda." (Hard. vii. 35.)

that for every parish church there should be made a *tabernaculum*, seemly and fair, wherein the pyx might be safely kept.[1] The synodical decrees of Bishop Quivil of Exeter (1287) mention as part of the necessary furniture of the church a fixed *sacramentarium* of stone.[2] From these records it is perfectly clear that even in England, where suspension of the pyx was the common practice at this time, ecclesiastical authorities who desired to enforce the decree of the Lateran Council insisted upon the provision of an aumbry for reservation.[3]

Durandus, who wrote in the early part of the thir-

[1] "Ut in qualibet ecclesia parochiali fiat tabernaculum cum clausura decens et honestum secundum curae magnitudinem et ecclesiae facultates, in quo ipsum Corpus Domini in pyxide pulcherrima et lineis tegumentis . . . collocetur." (Wilkins, *Concil.* II. 48.)

A gloss by Lyndwood, sometimes misunderstood (*e.g.* by Scudamore *N.E.*, p. 913), is as follows: "Simile habes *extra. de celeb. Mis. cap. Sane* (a reference to Canon Law, *Decret.* III. 41. c. 10) ubi dicitur quod in loco singulari, mundo et signato debet servari eucharistia. Et ex hoc videtur quod usus observatus in Anglia, ut scilicet in canopeo pendeat super altare, non est commendabilis, quia contra mentem dicti cap. *Sane* ubi statuitur quod non custodiatur in loco patenti sed singulari. Licet enim consuetudo anglicana commendabilis sit illa consideratione qua citius repraesentatur nostris aspectibus adoranda, non tamen est commendabilis eo respectu quo ponitur in loco publico, sic quod ad eam manus temerariae de facili valeant extendi. Nam licet in cuppa quae forsan clausa est pendeat, tamen ad illam deorsum mittendam, vel forsan cum illa cuppa totaliter auferendam, manus temerariae de facili possunt opponi. Et ideo, ut mihi videtur, commendabilior est usus aliorum locorum quae vidi; viz. in Hollandia et Portugallia, in quibus ordinatur unus locus singularis honestus prope altare, in quo reponitur eucharistia sub clavibus infra parietes vel locum bene munitum conservanda, sic quod nullus ad ipsam eucharistiam accedere poterit, nisi sacerdos loci illius clavem custodiens." (*Provinc.* III. 25, p. 248.)

He takes *tabernaculum cum clausura* to mean a locked cupboard, and prefers it to the hanging pyx as a place of greater security. It is noteworthy that he writes as though no "tabernacles" were in use in this country at the time (*c.* 1433).

[2] "sacramentarium lapideum et immobile." (Wilkins, *Concil.* ii, p. 139.) Ducange (*Glossar.* s.v.) takes this to mean an altar-slab: "id est, lapis in quo sacrosanctum sacrificium peragitur."

[3] For a discussion on the "tabernacle" as the place of Reservation in mediaeval England and Scotland, see Bridgett, *op. cit.*, pp. 173–187, especially the note (on pp. 186, 187) by Fr. Thurston: also *Trans. St. Paul's Eccl. Socy.* III, "Practical considerations on the Gothic or English altar," J. N. Comper, pp. 199 ff; and IV, "The Reasonableness of the Ornaments Rubric," etc., by the same author, pp. 80 ff.

teenth century, remarks that as in the dispensation of the Ancient Law the mercy-seat was above the ark of the covenant, so in his day there were churches in which an ark or tabernacle above the altar contained the sacrament and the holy relics.[1]

The tabernacle, or aumbry, need not be over the altar; it might be built anywhere in the chancel walls. It was still used for reservation in some of the churches visited in the early years of the eighteenth century by the authors of the "*Voyage Littéraire*,"[2] although in other places they remark that the aumbry was no longer used for this purpose. The Eucharist was commonly kept in such places in the south of Europe until the sixteenth century,[3] but it was in Germany and the Low Countries, and later in Scotland, that the aumbry reached its highest development in the form of an elaborate sacrament house.

[1] *Rationale divin. offic.* I. ii. 5: "in quibusdam ecclesiis super altare collocatur arca seu tabernaculum in quo Corpus Domini et reliquiae ponuntur." The juxtaposition of Host and relics was forbidden at a later date.

[2] *Voyage Littéraire de deux religieux Bénédictines* (Paris, 1717). *e.g.* at the abbey of St. John at Autun, "on voit . . . derrière l'autel, un peu à côté, une petite armoire où l'on gardoit autrefois le saint Sacrement." (I. p. 160.) In Maurienne Cathedral, "le saint Sacrement non plus qu'à Moutier ne se conserve pas au grand autel, mais à côté, dans un tabernacle d'un très-beau travail. Il est dans un vase de marbre, dans lequel il y a une petite boëte où il est renfermé." (I. p. 147.) In the church of the Praemonstratensian monastery at Case-Dieu, "ou y conservoit autrefois le saint Sacrement à côté de l'autel." (II. p. 13.) At the Austinian abbey of Choque there was, "à côté de l'autel, une pyramide de marbre d'un travail admirable, qui s'élève presque jusqu' à la voûte, dans laquelle on conserve le très-saint Sacrement"—*i.e.* a regular Sacrament house. (II. p. 183.)

[3] Thiers (*Exposition*, p. 38) cites a sixteenth-century bishop of Cosenza in Calabria as writing to this effect: "La coûtume qu'on avoit de conserver le tres-saint Sacrement dans des armoires bastis dans la mvraille a côté de l'autel, est déja perduë par tout ce diocése, encore, qu'ils fussent ornés par le dehors d'images et peintures d'or et d'azur, selon l'ancien usage non plus approuvé par la sainte Eglise, ainsi d'icelle saintement retranché par plusieurs raisons."

Mabillon (*de Azymo.* 8) says that in the north wall of the sanctuary there used to be aumbries in which the Eucharist was reserved. "This is even so now," he says, "in certain churches"; and he gives as an instance Santa Croce at Rome, but he is not quite sure about it. A similar arrangement was to be seen in his time in the parish church of St. John at Peronne, and a few years before at Fours and in some other churches.

C. THE ALTAR

Elsewhere the altar itself is apparently designated as the place of reservation. We must first of all refuse to see any allusion to the practice of reserving in some vessel upon or near the holy table in one or two stock passages quoted by the older ecclesiologists. Such are the story of Gorgonia in St. Gregory Nazianzen,[1] and certain verses written by St. Paulinus of Nola.[2] Regino has, however, two extracts that mention the sacrament as being reserved "*super altare.*" The first of these—"Let inquiry be made whether the pyx is always *super altare* with the sacred oblation for the *viaticum* of the sick"[3]—occurs in the list of questions to be asked at visitations. The second is that oft-quoted canon that refers to the intincted Host, and directs that the sacrament shall always be (kept) locked up *super altare* in order to avoid accidents and sacrilege.[4]

An injunction, sometimes quoted as a decree of Pope Leo IV, and incorporated into a number of tenth-century Capitulars and the like, runs as follows:—"Nothing is to be placed upon the altar (*super altare*) except the *capsae* and the relics, or perhaps the four Gospels, and the pyx with the Lord's Body for the *viaticum* of the sick."[5] All these

[1] See Appendix, p. 256.

[2] *Ep.* 32: "Divinum veneranda tegunt altaria foedus,
Compositisque sacra cum cruce martyribus
Cuncta salutiferi coëunt insignia Christi:
Crux, Corpus, Sanguis martyris, ipse Deus."
(*P.L.* lxi. 334.)

On which Mabillon's comment (*de Liturg. Gall.* I. 9, p. 94) is: "*Ipse Deus*, hoc est ipsum Domini Corpus in columba appensum in medio. Hic vero loquendi modus, *ipse Deus*, indubitanter asserit veram non umbraticam Christi in Eucharistia praesentiam."

[3] *Notitiae.* 9: "Inquirendum si pixida semper sit super altare cum sacra oblatione ad viaticum infirmis."

[4] I. 71: "Ut omnis presbyter habeat pixidem," etc. ". . . Semper sit (sacra oblatio) super altare obseratum propter mures et nefarios homines," etc.

Carmen de Lindisfarn 14:
"Porticus in medio, sancti quam fronde coronant,
Dum buxis claudunt pretiosae munera vitae."
(*P.L.* xcvi. 1338.)

[5] "Super altare nihil ponatur nisi capsae et reliquiae aut forte quatuor evangelia et buxida (*i.e.* pixida) cum Corpore Domini ad viaticum infirmis: caetera in nitido loco recondantur." The passage occurs in the Synodical

and other similar passages seem to refer to the use of an aumbry built in the walls at the back of or in the reredos behind the altar. *Super altare* will therefore most probably mean *above* the altar, and not upon it.[1]

We must note in passing that among the Greeks the movable *artophorium* stands directly upon the holy table; but formerly it was customary also to hang up the pyx in a bag on a nail or peg within the *eikonostasis*.[2]

As to the suspension of the Eucharist above or before the altar, this had become the common practice in some parts of Christendom by the twelfth century. We have no very definite information concerning the first appearance of this custom. The habit of hanging up symbolical figures of doves, especially in the neighbourhood of the font or the altars, and sometimes over tombs, was very ancient. It is noteworthy, too, that one of the earliest forms assumed by the vessel of reservation or its case was the shape of a dove.[3] The sacrament was possibly suspended at Lindisfarne; at any rate, the pyx was kept somewhere near the altar (*c.* A.D. 802).[4] But the first unambiguous reference to the use of a suspended vessel for reservation occurs in the *Life of St. Basil*, written by

decrees of Bishop Ratherius of Verona († A.D. 958) and other similar documents of the same age. It is also to be found in the forged "*Eutychiani Papae exhortatio*," printed in *P.L.* v. 165.

[1] But in the thirteenth-century Ordo Roman. of Peter Amelius it is said that the *cophinus* or pyx stood on the altar during service-time (*Mus. Ital.* II. p. 522); and a *capsa* stood in this position at Cluny, *Consuet. Antiquior.* xxv. (Albers, *Consuet. Monast.* ii. p. 22.) The use of this *capsa* is not stated.

Seventeenth-century ecclesiologists and some of later date have seen an early allusion to the position of the reserved sacrament in the third canon of the Second Council of Tours (A.D. 567), which enacts: "Ut Corpus Domini in altari non in imaginario ordine sed sub crucis titulo componatur." The reference is, of course, to the symbolical fraction of the Host and disposition of the fragments, a complicated ceremony according to Gallican rites, and one into which a certain amount of superstition had crept. Grotesque arrangements of the particles are forbidden by this canon: they may only be placed in the form of a cross.

These early writers supposed the prohibition to refer to the pyx containing the Eucharist, which, according to their misinterpretation of the canon, was not to be placed among the images (*imaginario ordine*) and relics of the saints, but either inside the altar cross or below it! They had in mind the later injunction forbidding the juxtaposition of Host and relics.

[2] See chap. xvii. [3] See chap. xiii., s.v. *Columba*.

[4] See the quotation above, p. 193.

the pseudo-Amphilochius (probably in the ninth century). Here it is related that the saint caused a golden dove to be fashioned, and, having placed in it a portion of the sacred Bread, hung it above the altar.[1]

Hugh of Flavigny[2] and Udalric of Cluny[3] in the eleventh century speak of suspension as the custom with which they were familiar. Reinerus of Liège (*c.* 1182) witnesses both to suspension and to the use of an aumbry for the custody of the pyx. He records that once a flash of lightning fused the iron chain by which the pyx was hung without damaging the receptacle of the Host;[4] and in another place tells how a fire, that was so fierce as to melt the bells, spared the wooden aumbry where the pyx was kept.[5]

In Italy and Spain suspension seems never to have been usual; the aumbry, as we have noted, continued in use in these countries until the growth of the cultus of the reserved sacrament led everywhere to a more conspicuous method of reservation.

SUSPENSION OF THE PYX IN ENGLISH CHURCHES

In spite of the industry of antiquarians and ecclesiologists, there are certain details connected with the custody of the reserved sacrament in mediaeval England that still remain obscure. Although no unambiguous reference to the custom seems to be known from an earlier date, there can be no doubt that from the twelfth century at least the

[1] *Vita S. Basilii*, c. 6: "τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐνθεὶς περιστερᾷ χρυσῇ ἐκρέμασεν ἐπάνω τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηρίου." As the result of a vision that appeared to him while celebrating, he is said to have divided the Host into three parts, one of which he consumed, another he preserved against his burial, and the third he placed in a golden dove above the altar. Later he sent for a goldsmith and caused him to make a new dove of gold for the preservation of this fragment of the Host.

[2] *Chron. Virudinens*: "pyxidem I de onychino in qua servaretur Corpus dominicum dependens super altare." (Cited by Ducange, *op. cit.* s.v. *Pyxis*.) [3] See p. 187.

[4] *Opusculum ad amicum*, etc. (*P.L.* cciv. 141.)

[5] *de incendio eccles. S. Lamberti*: "cum fuerit namque tanta conflagratio ut etiam campanas liquefecerit eiusdem ecclesiae, armariolum tamen ligneum quo in pixide clausum Corpus dominicum habebatur corrumpi adustioni non potuit." (*P.L.* cciv. 151 f.)

prevailing fashion was to hang up the Eucharist in a *cuppa* or pyx before or above the high altar.[1]

Here are subjoined a few extracts from inventories and other documents of early thirteenth-century date, relating to the Diocese of Sarum, in which the vessels used for reservation are described and the manner of custody is indicated.

When the new cathedral began to be built in 1220, William Brewer gave "a handsome *cuppa*, silver-gilt within and without, for reception of the Eucharist, with a silver hoop which was to be hung above the high altar" of the new church: "pulchram cuppam argenteam deauratam intus et extra ad reponendum eucharistiam, cum circulo argenteo, quae quidem dependet super magnum altare."[2] In an inventory of the ornaments of the cathedral,[3] that covers the years 1214–1222, the following vessels used for the reserved sacrament are noted. There was an empty and apparently discarded *turris*. It is named among the relics, and was probably preserved as a curiosity after the new custom of suspension came in: "turris una cooperta argento nichil continens."[4] There was also a silver dove slung in a hoop of the same metal: "Item, corona una argent. cum cathenis iii. argent. cum columba argent. ad eukaristiam."[5]

An additional inventory gives the ornaments presented to the cathedral during the time that Abraham de Winton held the office of treasurer. Here William Brewer's gift is recorded again, and with it "a costly vessel of silver in which the Eucharist is kept," given by Bishop Herbert Poore: "Item, vasculum unum argenteum pretiosum, in quo reponitur eucharistia."[6]

The record of a Visitation[7] made in the diocese about the year 1220 contains some points of interest in this matter. Among the ornaments of the Church of St. Peter at Swallowcliffe was a wooden pyx out of repair: "pyxis

[1] While King Stephen heard mass at Lincoln on Candlemas Day, 1141, "cecidit super altare pixis, cui Corpus Domini inerat, abrupto vinculo." (Rog. Hoveden, *Chron.* (R.S.) li. i. 201.)
[2] *Regist. S. Osmundi.* II, p. 13. (R.S. lxxviii. 2.)
[3] *ibid.*, pp. 127–136.
[4] *ibid.*, p. 128.
[5] *ibid.*, p. 129. See below, p. 211.
[6] *ibid.*, p. 137.
[7] *Regist. S. Osmundi.* I, pp. 275–314.

ad eucharistiam, lignea, debilis." It is noted as a defect; and a "pyxis ad eucharistiam honesta" is to be provided.[1] The church at Hill Deverel did not possess a pyx of any kind, and the Eucharist was reserved in a silk purse: "Non est ibi pixis continens eucharistiam, sed deponitur in quadam bursa serica."[2] Horningsham had a wooden pyx suspended in a silken case of some kind, which was called a *tabernacle*: "Pyxis lignea in tabernaculo serico dependens ultra altare continens eucharistiam."[3] At Mere they had three pyxes. One of ivory hung above the altar; another of silver was used for taking the sacrament to the sick; and the third, perhaps no longer in use, was of wood and decorated with paintings: ". . . una pixis eburnea dependens supra altare cum eucharistia, et alia argentea ponderis iii. solidorum, ad deferendum Corpus Domini infirmis; et alia lignea, depicta . . ."[4] The chapel at Hurst possessed a hanging pyx of Limoges work: "Item pixis dependens supra altare de opere Lemovicensi."[5] At Sunning there was a silver gilt pyx: "Pixis argentea, exterius deaurata, in qua reponitur eucharistia."[6] A number of other parishes visited do not seem to have possessed pyxes, for there is no mention of them in the lists of ornaments.

It may be well to call attention to the fact that the modern tabernacle, a little cupboard or coffer standing upon, or inserted into, a gradine at the high or other altar of a church is a late development of the locker or aumbry. Archbishop Peckham certainly ordered the use of an aumbry for greater security in reserving the Eucharist.[7] But his rule was apparently generally ignored, and suspension was the regular practice in this country during the later Middle Ages. For this reason the exceptional use of a standing coffer, for which we have evidence toward the end of the fifteenth century,[8] was of the nature of an innovation. It was more or less contemporaneous with the introduction into Scotland of sacrament houses of the Low Country model. In the following century

[1] *ibid.*, p. 311.
[2] *ibid.*, p. 312.
[3] *ibid.*, p. 313.
[4] *ibid.*, p. 291.
[5] *ibid.*, p. 281.
[6] *ibid.*, p. 276.
[7] See above, p. 191.
[8] *Trans. St. Paul's Eccl. Socy.* IV. u.s., p. 80 n.

we find Cranmer arguing against the hanging pyx;[1] and Cardinal Pole, during the Marian reaction, substituted the use of a locker or coffer for the pre-existing custom.[2] The events that followed Mary's reign prevented any further development in this direction.[3]

D. THE BAPTISTERY

The possibility of reservation in the baptistery for the communion of the newly-baptized need not detain us long.

[1] And against reservation generally, in answer to the Devonshire rebels, 1549: "Your fourth article is this, *We wil have the Sacrament hang over the high altar, and there to be worshipped, as it was wont to be; and they which wil not therto consent, we wil have them dy like Heretics against the holy Catholic Faith.* What say you, O ignorant people in things pertaining to God? Is this the holy Catholic Faith, that the sacrament should be hanged over the altar and worshipped? . . . I pray you, who made this Faith? Any other, but the Bishops of Rome? And that after more than a thousand years after the Faith of Christ was ful and perfect. Innocent III, about 1215 years after Christ, did ordain, that the sacrament and chrism should be kept under lock and key. But yet no motion be made of hanging the sacrament over the high altar, nor of the worshiping of it. After him came Honorius III, and he added further, commanding that the sacrament should be devoutly kept in a clean place and sealed, and that the priest should often teach the people reverently to bow down to the Host, when it is lifted up in the Mass time, and when the priests should cary it to the sick folkes. And although this Honorius added the worshipping of the sacrament, yet he made no mention of the hanging therof over the high altar, as your Article purporteth. Nor how long after, or by what means, that came first up into this realm, I think no man can tel. And in Italy it is not yet used until this day. And in the beginning of the Church it was not only not used to be hanged up, but also it was utterly forbid to be kept." (Strype, App. xl to *Memorials of Abp. Cranmer.*)

[2] "Fiat tabernaculum decens et honestum cum sera et clavi, quod in altum elevatum in medio summi altaris affigatur si commode fieri potest; alias in commodiori et honorabiliori summo altare vicino loco, qui haberi potest." (Wilkins, *op. cit.* iv. 121, 797.)

[3] Tabernaculum is sometimes used for the vessel in which the receptacle of the Eucharist was enclosed, *e.g.* in an extract from an early fourteenth-century inventory recorded in Ducange (*Glossar.* s.v.): "Item vas unum, quod dicitur tabernaculum, de argento cum cascia sua." A suspended silver-gilt tabernacle, containing a golden pyx (cupa) is noted in an inventory, belonging to the same century, of the ornaments of La Sainte Chapelle at Paris: "Quaedam cupa auri, ubi reconditum est sacrum Sacramentum, una cum tabernaculo argenti deaurato suspensum tribus cathenis argenteis." (Ducange, *u.s.*) We have already noted that the name *tabernacle* is applied to a silken covering for a wooden pyx in the visitation records of Salisbury (1220).

Where, as was not infrequently the case, the baptistery was a separate erection at some distance from the main building of the church, it might appear advantageous in some circumstances to communicate the neophytes there rather than in the basilica itself.[1] At the most this would be an instance of temporary reservation to meet a special need.[2] For constant reservation in the baptistery there is no evidence whatever.[3]

The original use of such altars as stand in the baptisteries of Pisa and Florence is doubtful; but it is worthy of note that Pope Hilary presented to the baptistery of the Lateran Church a turris of silver.[4]

[1] cf. *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét. s.v.* Baptistère, 392, 399.

[2] The numbers that were baptized on Easter Even made some provision for temporary reservation necessary. When the church at Constantinople was invaded by soldiers on Easter Even, in the time of St. Chrysostom, three thousand men had already been baptized, and there still remained the female catechumens. But the sacrament, reserved, as we have seen, in both kinds separately, was not apparently placed in the baptistery.

[3] The *columbae* that Severus took away from the fonts and altars of the churches of Antioch were in all probability purely ornamental figures.

Reference is made by some writers to the *calices baptismales* as connected with the communion of the newly-baptized in the baptistery. Ducange defines them thus: "in quibus recens baptizati post perceptam eucharistiam, dominicus Sanguis hauriendus datur," but they are more likely to have been the vessels in which a draught of honey and milk was given to the newborn member of the Church. Nothing is known for certain about the baptismal chalice or its use. The illustration of a vessel having this description in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéol. Chrétienne* is inserted merely on the strength of its bearing symbolical figures of fish and shells, which may allude to the common allegories connected with Baptism.

Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 401–417) is said to have given three baptismal chalices to a basilica at Rome. (*Liber Pontificalis*, edit. Duchesne I. p. 221) "calices argenteos ad baptismum iii. pens. sing. lib. ii."

[4] "turrem argenteam cum delfinos pens. lib. lx." This is placed under the heading, "Item ad sanctum Johannem intra sanctum fontem." (*op. cit.* I. p. 243.)

CHAPTER XIV

The Vessel of Reservation

THE most convenient method of describing the various forms assumed at one time or another by the vessel of reservation will be to arrange in alphabetical order the names by which it has been called, and to note where possible under each the approximate date of its first appearance and other points of interest. In this section we shall not scruple to go beyond the limits of our period whenever later usage seems to represent a survival of, or to throw light upon, earlier customs.

The list that is appended does not claim to be complete, and such general terms as *loculus*, *vas*, *vasculum*, *repositorium*, *gerulum*, etc., are purposely omitted.

It is not possible to divide the different types into groups according as the vessels were suspended or not, because custom varies from place to place and from time to time. Nor can any absolute distinction be maintained between vessels used for private and for official reservation; for some, *e.g.* the *Chrismal*, were employed for both purposes. We must also take note of the fact that it came to be usual for two vessels to be provided: one to be constantly in the church, and one to be used for carrying the Eucharist abroad to the sick.[1]

As for the material used in making the receptacle of the sacrament, the precious metals were naturally always regarded as most suitable. From an early date we have mention of vessels of gold, silver, and silver-gilt. Copper and orichalcum (*i.e.* brass) were used when nobler metals were not to be obtained. Ivory was at one time much in

[1] *e.g. Constit. Provinc. S. Edmundi Cant. Archiep.* (1236): "... habeat sacerdos aliam pixidem mundam et honestam in qua sit linea bursa munda et in ea Corpus dominicum deferat ad aegrotum." (Wilkins, *Concil.* I. 657.) *ibid.*: "... una (pixis) semper in ecclesia remaneat, et in alia in qua sit Eucharistia in bursa posita mundissima, in qua deferat Corpus dominicum ad aegrotum. ..." (*u.s.* 638.)

favour. Less commonly rock-crystal[1] and onyx and even glass were employed. Wooden vessels were used for lack of better; and for some reason or other they had a cork pyx in the hanging dove at Cluny. Occasionally a silken purse served as the receptacle of the reserved Host.[2]

The sacrament was not as a rule immediately in contact with the vessel that contained it; it was commonly wrapped in a silken or linen corporal.[3]

Arca, Arcula.—A general term for a box or chest, made of wood or metal or other material. St. Cyprian uses it to describe the vessel in which people were accustomed to keep the sacrament in their homes;[4] and a wooden box is mentioned as being used for the same purpose in the *Life of St. Inda* according to Simeon Metaphrastes.[5] It is from another late source that there comes a passage in which the word *arca* is used of the receptacle wherein the sacrament was reserved in church.[6] In view of the fashion

[1] Durandus, *Rationale* I. iii. 25.

[2] The use of a purse alone for reserving the Host is forbidden, *e.g.* by Archbishop Peckham in his *Constitutions* (1281): "Dignissimum Eucharistiae sacramentum praecipimus de caetero taliter custodiri ut videlicet in bursa vel loculo propter comminutionis periculum nullatenus collocetur, sed in pixide pulcherrima intrinsecus lino candidissimo adornata, in qua ipsum Corpus Domini repositum in aliquo cooperticulo de serico, purpura vel lino purissimo operiri praecipimus, ita quod sine comminutionis periculo possit inde faciliter extrahi et apponi." (Wilkins, *op. cit.* ii. 48.)

[3] Stated, *e.g.* in Bernard's version of the Cluniac *Consuetudines*. The use of a corporal for this purpose is frequently required in mediaeval regulations concerning the custody of the reserved sacrament. Modern Orthodox allow the Eucharist to be placed directly in contact with gold or silver. Where the receptacle is of inferior materials, they insert a piece of clean paper.

[4] *de Lapsis*. 26: "arcam suam in quo Domini sanctum fuit." (Hartel, p. 256.)

[5] *Passio*. 6: "lignea arcula in qua reposuerant sacram oblationem"; see the Latin version of Surius (December 28th)—the only form in which the reference could be consulted. St. Inda and St. Domna are said to have been martyred in the fourth century.

[6] *Vita S. Eudociae* xii: "Verum antequam traderet ultro se lupis agna Christi, brevi mora impetrata prodeundi, accurrit in sacram aedem (*i.e.* the convent church), reserataque illic arcula in qua divinum reliquiarum sancti Corporis Christi servabatur, inde particulam acceptam sinu recondidit; et sic statim cum militibus abiit." (*AA.SS.*, March 1st, p. 19). St. Eudocia is a mythical saint of the second century; her life was written after A.D. 600. The *arca* mentioned by St. Augustine (*contra Crescon. Donat.* iii. 33) was probably the treasury-chest or poor-box.

popular in patristic times of finding exact parallels between the worship of the Old and the New Israel, it is rather remarkable that the term did not come into common use for whatever vessel was used for reserving the Eucharist.[1] Among ecclesiastical writers and in the Vulgate *arca* is the equivalent of ארון *aron*, the Ark of the Covenant; and manna is, of course, frequently the type of the Eucharist. But the nearest approach to an identification of the receptacle of the sacrament with the Ark or the Host with its contents occurs in a highly metaphorical passage in St. Ambrose.[2]

ARTOPHORIUM (ἀρτοφόριον).—The usual name for the receptacle of the reserved Eucharist among the Greeks: from what date it is uncertain. Synonyms: πυξίς, πυξίον, πυξομῆλον (all rare). It is called by the Russians, *kivot*, *i.e.* κιβώτιον, and *kovtcheg*, which is the equivalent of *arca*. These and other forms of the pyx used in the Eastern Churches are described in chapter xvii.

CALIX.—It has been suggested in a previous chapter that when the Host was steeped in the species of Wine, the chalice would have been a suitable vessel for reserving in a conjoint manner.[3] We are not, as we have seen, without evidence for this usage. The *Life of St. Odilia* represents her as calling for the chalice to be fetched in which were reserved the Body and Blood of the Lord;[4] and St. Peter Damian furnishes another example of the

[1] It is worthy of note that the *arca* or *tabout* of the Ethiopic Liturgy has been the subject of much discussion. The term is the same word as the borrowed תבה, *tebhah*, in Hebrew, which means originally a box; but תבה is not used in the Scriptures for the Ark of the Covenant; that is always ארון. Major Harris (*Highlands of Ethiopia* iii. p. 138) declared that the *tabout* contained records of the church to which it belonged. Neale (*Eastern Church*, General Introduction i. p. 186) believed that the *tabout*, for which a Benediction is provided, contained the reserved sacrament. Renaudot (*Lit. Orient. Collect.* i. p. 474) translates the title of the Benediction: *oratio super arcam sive discum maiorem*. Brightman (*Liturgies, Eastern*, p. 589) and Cabrol-Leclercq (*Dict. s.v.* Arca) understand it to mean the altar-slab or altar-board, and, by extension, the altar itself.

[2] *Ep.* IV. 4. (See p. 107.) Kempe (*Reservation*, p. 119) refers this passage to St. Augustine, and, quoting the text as containing the phrase "in doliis aureis," adduces it as evidence for the separate reservation of the species of Wine.

[3] See pp. 138, 149.

[4] *Vita* 22: "calicem in quo dominicum corpus et sanguis habebatur." (*M. G. H. Vitæ*, vi. p. 50.)

same kind.[1] To these may be added the more ambiguous allusion that is contained in a *distichon in calice*, appended to the letters of Pope Gerbert:—

> "Hence flee both thirst and hunger: hasten, then, ye faithful,
> Bishop Adalbert distributes these treasures to the people."[2]

The "*calices ad communicandos infirmos*," not infrequently mentioned in mediaeval literature, were not used for reserving the sacrament. They were employed for those forms of intinction in which the Host was dipped before delivery into unconsecrated liquid; and, later, as the vessels over which the minister of *viaticum* held the sacramental Bread as he bore it to the invalid. From this vessel also the draught (*purificatio oris*) was given after reception of the Eucharist in clinical communion.[3]

CANISTRUM.—A wicker basket, such as was used to contain household stores and the like. St. Jerome says of Bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse that he was accustomed to carry the sacred elements in a *canistrum vimineum*, and in a vessel of glass.[4] In such baskets Dorotheus, Bishop of Thessalonica, caused the eucharistic Bread to be distributed among the people before the emissaries of Pope Hormisdas arrived in his diocese (A.D. 519).[5]

The eucharistic Bread lies in a wicker basket in some of the pictures in the Catacombs illustrating or allusive to

[1] *opuscula varia*. xlvii. 2: ". . . dum sacri muneris eucharistiam detulisset aegroto . . . aliquantulum dominici sanguinis remansit in calice." (*P.L.* cxlv. 712.)

[2] "Hinc sitis atque fames fugiunt: properate fideles,
Dividit in populo has praesul Adalbero gazas."
(Quoted by Mabillon, *Praefationes*, Saec. III. p. 117.)

[3] "Calices ad communicandos infirmos" are referred to, *e.g.* in the *Synodical Statutes* of Odo of Paris: "calices quibus infirmi communicantur decorentur et mundi custodiantur ut devotius communicent infirmi" (Hard. vi. 2. 1939); and frequently in later documents. Smend (*Kelchverspendung*, etc., p. 16) mentions one of these vessels in the cathedral at Prague. It was described in an Inventory of 1354 as: "Item, cyphus ovichinus cum pede argenteo deaurato pro infirmis et pro communicantibus in Parasceve deputatus."

[4] *Epist.* (125) *ad Rustic.* 20: ". . . qui corpus domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro." (*P.L.* xxii. 1085.)

[5] It is reckoned a count against him in the indictment drawn up by his opponents: "Si haeretici non sunt, quomodo tanta sacramenta confecerunt ut canistra plena omnibus erogarent, ne imminente (sicut dicebant) persecutione communicare non possent?" (*P.L.* lxiii. 482.)

the sacrament.[1] The Feeding of the Five Thousand and the eucharistic discourse in *St. John* vi are illustrated by baskets full of round cakes marked with a cross.[2] The use of *canistra* among the Jews for the firstfruits, and of *cistae* among the Greeks for a like purpose, *e.g.* at the feasts of Bacchus, may have suggested this manner of reserving and distributing the Eucharist.[3]

CAPSA, CAPSULA, CAPSIS.—Used of the cases, generally of cylindrical form, in which the manuscript scrolls of the ancients were stored.

In ecclesiastical use, as early as the Council of Orange (A.D. 441), *capsa* is the name of some sort of eucharistic vessel. Canon 17 of this council orders that "Along with the capsa, the chalice also is to be offered and consecrated by admixture of the Eucharist."[4] Such is the bald translation of the injunction. It is difficult to get at its exact meaning. The following is the substance of a note appended in Hefele-Leclercq. At the same time that the *capsa*, that is to say, the *turris* (*tour*) that contains the obleys, is offered, there should also be offered the chalice, that its contents may be consecrated by admixture with a portion of the Host.[5] But the opinion of Dom Ceillier is also cited, who believes that the allusion is to the *Sancta*, which in the Roman rite was brought in at the beginning

[1] de Rossi, *Inscript. Christ* (passim) : *Dict. d'Archéol.* s.v.v. Canistrum, Ciste. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane* (1903), pl. 28.

In the cemetery of Callixtus there are two paintings representing the symbolical fish (ΙΧΘΥΣ) having a *cista* in the foreground filled with round loaves. The use of red pigment in the interstices of the wicker work suggests that there is some intention of representing the sacred Wine.

[2] *D.C.A.* s.v. *Eucharist* (in Christian Art).

[3] "C'est surtout dans la célébration des mystères antiques que la ciste occupe un rang distingué ; son rôle y était parfaitement determiné et invariable. La ciste, fermée d'un couvercle, servait à conserver, cachés aux yeux des profanes, ces objets sacrés et mystérieux (ἱερά) dont la révélation aux mystes constituait l'acte essentiel de toutes les initiations ; cet acte, que l'on appelait, παράδοσις τῶν ἱερῶν, comprenait presque toujours une véritable communion, car dans les objets de la ciste, il y avait des gâteaux, auxquels goûtaient les initiés." (*Dict. d'Archéol.* s.v. Ciste.)

[4] *Can.* 17 : "cum capsa et calix offerendus est et admixtione eucharistiae consecrandus." (Hard. I. 1785). Some MSS. read *inferendus* for *offerendus*.

[5] *Hist. des Conciles.* II. pt. I, p. 444 : "Avec la *capsa* (tour contenant le pain à consacrer) on doit offrir en même temps le calice pour le consacrer (*consecrare*) en y mêlant une parcelle de l'eucharistie."

of the mass, but at a later point according to the Gallican use.[1]

In the *Ordo Romanus Primus* the word *capsa* occurs in the description of the Introit : "Two acolytes holding the open *capsae* containing the *Sancta*," which the Pontiff salutes with bowed head.[2] The form *capsis* is used in the eleventh-century *Ordo Romanus X*, where the phrase "a decorated *capsis* with the Body of the Lord reserved from the previous day" is found in the rationale of the Good Friday services.[3] So again, in a later Roman *Ordo*, numbered XI in Mabillon's collection, *capsula* is the receptacle of the reserved Eucharist used at the communion of the Presanctified.[4]

[1] *ibid.* "Le diacre apportait alors cette hostie déjà consacrée dans un vase particulier, *capsa*. Notre canon demande que cette coutume soit conservée, et que l'on place toujours en même temps sur l'autel cette *capsa*, de même que le calice ; on devait aussi déposer une parcelle de l'hostie dans le calice. . . . Le sens du mot *consacrer* s'explique par ces mots : 'haec communicatio et consecratio' que le prêtre récite encore aujourd'hui lorsqu'il met une partie de l'hostie dans le calice."

Mabillon (*Comment. in Ordo Roman. Prim.*, p. cxxxix. *Mus. Ital.* ii) remarks on this canon : "Is vero mihi sensus huiusce loci videtur, nempe ut una cum capsa in qua sacra suppelex initio Missae ad altare, fortasse etiam Eucharistia, deferebatur, etiam et calix afferetur ; qui calix postea consecratus, immissa in eum Eucharistia de more particula utramque speciem consecratam simul contineret et quasi una eademque consecratione sacratus esset." His supposition that the *capsa* contained the *sacra supellex* is accounted for if he read *ministerium* for *mysterium* in Gregory of Tours' story (see p. 78). Lower down in the same note Mabillon refers to this. Thiers (*Exposition*, p. 41) also read *ministerium* in that place, and will not allow, as Mabillon does, that the *turris* might contain the consecrated Host. See *Turris*.

[2] *O.R.P.* 8 : "duo acolythi tenentes capsas cum sanctis apertas." (Atchley, p. 128.) Binterim (*Denkwürdigkeiten* vii. I. 369) takes *Sancta* to mean the unconsecrated obleys, which are so termed, he says, by anticipation ; and he draws a parallel between the Roman rite and the greater entrance of the Eastern Church.

Mabillon (*ubi supra*) remarks : "capsa ad praeferendam Pontificis sacra facturo eucharistiam sumatur : cum alia vocabula rem loco fixam significent."

[3] *O.R.P.* x. 13 : "adornatum capsidem cum dominico corpore hesterna die reservato." (*Mus. Ital.* ii, p. 102.) In the account of the services of *Coena Domini*, it is termed the pyx : "corpus domini positum in pyxide." (*ibid.*, p. 101.)

[4] *O.R.P.* xi. 42 : "In parasceve . . . quidam cardinalis honorifice portat corpus domini praeteriti diei conservatum in capsula corporalium." (*ibid.*, p. 137.)

CHRISMALE.—Great variety of spelling exists: *chrismal*, *crismal*, *crisma*, etc. The term was originally used of the vessel containing the chrism;[1] and in the forms *chrismatorium*, *chrismarium*, with their variants, it appears always to have this meaning. But in Celtic hagiography, in the penitentials and many sacramentaries, this name is commonly given to some kind of receptacle for the reserved Eucharist. This use of the term has, on the whole, a Celtic *provenance*. The reason for the transition from its original meaning is to be found, perhaps, in the similarity of shape that existed between the vessels employed for these two purposes.

The *chrismal* as a receptacle for the Host privately reserved and borne upon the person is mentioned in the *Life* of St. Comgall,[2] and in that of St. Mochoemog.[3] With these may be compared some of the directions given in the second part of the *Rule of St. Columban*. Here we find such statements as these: "Whosoever shall forget his chrismal when he goes far afield to his labours shall receive twenty-five stripes. If he drops it on the ground and finds it immediately, fifty stripes. If he hangs it up on a tree and leaves it there all night thirty stripes"; and so forth.[4]

From this it is clear that the Celtic monk was supposed to carry the sacrament with him wherever he went, and to lay it aside as he laboured in the fields. The *Penitential of Cumean* provides penances for the loss of the chrismal or its contents by various accidents:[5] and that of Halitgar

[1] *Crismal* has this sense in a document of the seventh century, included in *Saecul. vii et viii Eccl. Mon.* (*P.L.* lxxxviii. 1184.)

[2] *Vita S. Comgalli.* 22. "Quodam die cum sanctus Comgallus esset solus in agro operans, posuit crismale (*al.* crismal) suum super vestem suam." (Plummer, *Vitae Sanctor. Hibern.* II, p. 11.)

[3] *Vita S. Mochoemog.* 18. "Buculus meus et crismale (al. crismal) cum isto interim in extremo loco sepelientur." (*ibid.*, p. 173.)

[4] c. 10. "Qui oblitus fuerit chrismal, pergens procul ad opus aliquod, quinis quinquies percussionibus. Si super terram in agro dimiserit et invenerit statim, denis quinquies percussionibus: si in ligno illud levaverit, ter denis, si ibi maneat nocte, suppositione. . . . Cui chrismal ceciderit et nihil confringens, duodecim percussionibus." (*P.L.* lxxx. 217, 219.)

[5] *de Mensura Poenit.* 13. "Qui non bene custodierit sacrificium et mus comederit illud, quadraginta dies poeniteat; qui autem perdiderit in ecclesia, et [aut] pars ceciderit, et non inventa fuerit, viginti dies poeniteat; qui autem perdiderit suum chrismale aut solum sacrificium in regione [loco] qualibet, et non invenitur, tribus quadragesimis vel anno poeniteat. . . .

also considers the loss of the sacred contents as well as of the vessel itself.[1] The *penitential* that goes by the name of Theodore uses the form *chrisma* in similar injunctions.[2]

Elsewhere we find that the name was not restricted to the little case or box in which the sacrament was privately reserved. It was also used of the vessel in which the Eucharist was kept in churches. Instances of this use occur in forms for hallowing the receptacle of the reserved sacrament, in the *Missale Francorum* and a number of "Gregorian" sacramentaries.[3] Such a vessel is described in verse by St. Aldhelm in a letter to one Acircius: it was made of gold and elaborately decorated with jewels.[4]

CIBORIUM (κιβώριον).—As an ecclesiastical term, *ciborium* at first meant the domed canopy over the altar. The other use of the word, in the sense of a receptacle for the Host, appears to be late. Scudamore remarks that it first occurs with this meaning in the *Chronicles* of Hariulf of Centule;[5]

Qui autem mergit sacrificium, continuo bibat aquam et quod in chrismale fuerit sumet sacrificium et emendet per decem dies culpam solutus." (*P.L.* lxxxvii. 996.)

[1] *in Poenitent.* 10. ". . . qui autem perdiderit suum crismal aut solum sacrificium in regione qualibet ut non inveniatur . . . poeniteat." (Schmitz, *Bussbücher* (1898), p. 298.)

[2] *Lib. poenitent.* 40. ". . . qui autem perdiderit suum crisma, aut solum sacrificium . . ." p. 300. cf. also Pen. *pseudo-Egbert*, xii. 6. "qui autem in plebe suum crismal perdiderit, et non invenit . . . poeniteat." (Haddan and Stubbs, iii, p. 428.) *In plebe*, presumably means when visiting, or going about from house to house.

Pseudo-Bede contains a similar injunction: "Qui autem in plebem suum chrismalem perdiderit. . . ." (*P.L.* xciv. 574.)

[3] See the section dealing with the consecration of the vessel of reservation at the end of the present chapter.

[4] "de Crismale, sive Chrismaro.

Alma domus veneror divino munere plena;
Valvas sed nullus reserat, nectimina pandit,
Culmina ni fuerint aulis sublata quaternis,
Et licet exterius rutilent de corpore gemmae,
Aurea dum fulvis flavescit bulla metallis:
Sed tamen uberius ditantur viscera, crassa
Potis qua species flagrat pulcherrima Christi.
Candida sanctarum sic floret gloria rerum
Nec trabes in templo surgunt, nec tecta columnis."

(*Opera*, Giles, p. 264.)

[5] *N.E.*, p. 912. The passages referred to occur in a description of the altars and their ornaments in the Church of St. Riquier, and elsewhere at Centule. *Chron.* II. 5: "de altariis et altariorum sanctique [Ricarii]

but this is certainly a modern instance of the mistake often made by the older ecclesiologists, who frequently confused the two senses of the word.[1]

Perhaps some confusion between κιβώριον [2] and κιβώτιον, a little box (a term that is in common use among the Russian Orthodox for the receptacle of the Host),[3] may account for the use of *ciborium* as a name for the pyx; and a false etymology connecting the word with *cibus* may also have been responsible for the perpetuation of the error.

No indisputable use of the term in this latter sense can be found before the fourteenth century, at which time it appears frequently.[4] Ducange has several passages illustrating the use of the word for the vessel of reservation.[5]

ornatu. . . . Id sunt in ecclesia sancti Salvatoris, sanctique Ricarii altaria fabricata undecim, ciboria duo, lectoria auro, argento et marmoribus parata duo. In ecclesia sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae et sanctorum Apostolorum altaria fabricata xiii, ciborium unum et lectorium optime paratum unum." (D'Achery, *Spicileg.* II, p. 306.)

[1] Macri (*Hierolexicon*) alludes to the Life of Pope Leo III (in the *Liber Pontificalis*) and takes "*ciborium . . . ex argento purissimo*" to mean a pyx, where, in point of fact (as always in this work) the canopy above an altar is intended. So again, Thiers (*Exposition*, p. 39) gives a list of churches in Rome where *ciboria* are to be seen, under the impression that they are receptacles of the reserved eucharist. Martigny (*s.v.*) "is of opinion that, besides the usual *ciborium*, the columns of which rested on the ground, there was sometimes a lesser one, the columns of which rested on the *mensa* of the altar: and that these last were more properly called *peristeria*, as enclosing a vessel in the shape of a dove, in which the Host was contained." But Martigny's authorities (*Liber Pont.* passim) are not at all in favour of this interpretation. See *D.C.A.* s.v. Altar, where Martigny's remarks are cited.

[2] κιβώριον is originally the hollow seed-case of the Egyptian "bean" (*Nymphaea nelumbo*), and is used for a drinking-cup (*e.g.* Didym. ap. Ath. 477e. Liddell & Scott) because of the resemblance of such a vessel to the seed-case. Hence, in secular use, its signification of a vase or cup is earlier than its meaning of a hollow dome.

[3] *Kivot.* (See *artophorium* supra.)

[4] Scudamore *u.s.* *Invent. S. Capell.* Paris, 1376: "Item quoddam repositorium sive cigboire *gallice* quod supra maius altare est appensum, in quo est quaedam cupa auri ubi reconditum est sacrum sacramentum." (Ducange, *Glossar. s.v.* Repositorium.)

[5] *op. cit.*, s.v.: "die crastina octavae ss. sacramenti debet celebrari missa de requiem ad maius altare pro domino Papa Clemente vii, quondam Episcopo Morinensi, qui dedit ecclesiae Morin. quandam cappam notabilem ac vas seu ciborium deauratum ad deferendum corpus dominicum in die ss. sacramenti altaris." (*Obituar. Eccle. Morin.* ann. 1440.)

"Le suppliant print dedens le ciboire ung calixe avec lequel estoit enveloppé une petite boite dedens laquelle estoit le corps de Notre Seigneur." (*Lit. remiss.* ann. 1443 in Reg. 176. Chartoph reg., c. 278.)

Ciborium is probably intended by *Siboigne*, in the sixteenth-century extract cited by Ducange: ". . . une lampe devant le siboigne de l'église du dit Seunc. . . ."

COLUMBA, περιστερά.—Gifts to churches in early days often took the form of *columbae*. It is not possible to determine whether at first these were always merely symbolical ornaments, or whether they were sometimes receptacles made in the shape of a dove for the reservation of the Eucharist. But it is noteworthy that in the earliest allusions to such gifts the *columbae* are named in association with eucharistic vessels, such as the paten, the chalice, and the *turris*.[1] Constantine gave a dove to St. Peter's Church

[1] There is little doubt that the *columbae* which the heretic Severus took away from the baptisteries and from over the altars at Antioch were purely ornamental objects. The complaint of the clergy of Antioch concerning his action, which was presented at the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 536) is given: "τὰς εἰς τύπον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χρυσᾶς τε καὶ ἀργυρᾶς περιστερὰς κρεμαμένας ὑπεράνω τῶν θείων κολυμβηθρῶν καὶ θυσιαστηρίων." The ground upon which Severus removed them is stated. He disapproved of the use of such symbolical images of the Holy Ghost. See p. 198, above, *Reservation in the Baptistery*. Many writers are apt to see an allusion to reservation of the Eucharist in any and every mention of a dove, not only in ecclesiological, but even in theological contexts. *e.g.* Paulinus of Nola, in one of his descriptive letters, writing of the decoration of churches, introduces a poem with the line, "et per columbam Spiritus Sanctus fluit." A long note is appended to this in Migne, *P.L.* lxi. 336. And there is, according to Cabrol and Leclercq (*Dict.* s.v. colombe eucharistique), a eucharistic context to Sedulius' verse, ". . . Sanctusque columbae Spiritus in specie Christum vestivit honore." (*Carmen Paschale*, II. 168, 169.)

St. John Chrysostom is hardly to be taken as witness for the reservation of the sacrament in a *columba*, when, speaking of the Host upon the altar, he says that our Saviour is present no longer in a cradle, wrapped in swaddling bands, but clothed with the Holy Ghost (*Homil. xiii, ad populum Antioch*). He is obviously referring to the Presence of Christ in the sacrament, at the celebration of the Liturgy, that is brought about by the power of the Holy Spirit; and there is no reference at all to reservation. Again, it is altogether fanciful to see any such reference in the passage of Tertullian (*adv. Valentin.* 3) "Nostrae columbae etiam domus simplex, in editis semper et apertis at ad lucem. Amat figura Spiritus Sancti orientem, Christi figuram." Yet these are quoted in Cabrol and Leclercq. *Dict.* s.v. colombe eucharistique.

There is a story told about a golden dove, that either hung suspended or was otherwise placed above the tomb of a saint, in the *Gloria Martyrum* of Gregory of Tours († A.D. 594). If, as is possible, the tomb was also an

at Rome.[1] In the following century the Popes Innocent I[2] and Hilary[3] are said to have made similar presents to other basilicas in the city.

The so-called *Will of St. Perpetuus of Tours* contains the direction that one of the legatees, a priest named Amalarius, is to receive a silver dove for use as a receptacle of the sacrament; unless the Church at Tours would rather give that which was there in use to Amalarius, and keep for itself the dove bestowed in the will.[4] Reference has already been made to the suspended dove of gold in which St. Basil is said by his ninth-century biographer to have placed a portion of the Host.[5]

When the suspended dove came to be in many places the usual vessel for reservation, the sacrament was generally enclosed immediately in a little pyx,[6] which was placed in the body of the *columba*. At a later date the memory of the ancient fashion sometimes survived in the figure of a dove surmounting the vessel of reservation itself, or the canopy that veiled it.[7] *Columbae* were not commonly

altar, the *columba* may have contained a portion of the sacrament. But no such statement is made in the text: "Super sepulchrum sanctum calcare non metuens (*scil.* an officer of King Sigebert, who was then besieging Paris) dum columbam auream laceam quaerit elidere." (*P.L.* lxxi. 769.)

[1] *Liber Pontificalis* (Silvester xxiii). "Patenam auream cum turrem, ex auro purissimo cum columbam, ornatam gemmis prasinis et yachintis qui sunt numero margaritis ccxv, pens. lib. xxx." (Duchesne, I, p. 176.) cf. p. 199, supra. The text is varied in some MSS.: "cum turre . . . cum columba."

[2] *op. cit.* (xlii). "turrem argenteam cum patenam et columbam deauratam, pens. lib. xxx." (*ibid.*, p. 220.) This gift was made to the basilica of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius.

[3] *op. cit.* (xlviii). "columbam auream, pens. lib. II," following "turrem argenteam." (*ibid.*, p. 243.) Given to St. John Lateran, for the baptistery. (See p. 199, *supra.*)

[4] "Similiter et Amalario ibidem presbytero . . . peristerium et columbam argenteam ad repositorium; nisi maluerit ecclesia mea illam qua utitur eidem Amalario transmittere, meam retinere." (*P.L.* lviii. 753.) *Peristerium*—"Ciborium in cujus cavo appensa est columba, ex qua pendebat pyxis sacram eucharistiam continens." (Ducange, *Glossar.*, s.v.—a sort of canopy above the eucharistic dove.)

[5] *Vita St. Basilii.* 6. (See p. 195, *supra.*)

[6] The pyx enclosed in the dove was made of cork at Cluny in the eleventh century. (cf. p. 187, supra, and Mabillon, *Iter. Ital.* in *Mus. Ital.* I, p. 217.)

[7] "Dans l'église collégiale de St. Julien (d'Angers)," writes Moleon, "le saint ciboire est suspendu en haut audessus de l'autel: il y a une

suspended in some parts of Europe, *e.g.* in Italy, or at least this kind of vessel disappeared in certain areas at a comparatively early date.[1] Elsewhere they were long in use. A number survived until the seventeenth century, and even later, in France; they were remarked as curiosities by ecclesiologists and antiquaries, but in some instances they were still in actual use.[2] Eucharistic doves were very rare in England.[3]

colombe audessus." (*Voyage Liturg.*, p. 103.) Thiers also refers to such figures. (*Exposition*, I, p. 36.)

[1] cf. Archbishop Cranmer's reply to the Devonshire insurgents. (Strype, *Life of Cranmer*, No. xl. art. 4); and cf. Mabillon (*Itin. Ital.* u.s., p. 186): "in Italicis basilicis nusquam suspensa est eucharistia." He noted as a great curiosity the dove that he saw in the sacrarium of the monastic church at Bobbio: "vetus columba ex aurichalco ad reponendum olim viaticum." (*ibid.*, p. 215.) Chardon thought that St. Columban might have brought it with him from Burgundy to Bobbio in A.D. 614: his name is enough to have suggested this.

[2] Macri, in his *Hierolexicon*, published in 1677, writes under the article "Ciborium": ". . . antiquorum usus erat conservandi hoc sacramentum in quibusdam columbis . . . super altare pendentibus, ut adhuc mos est in aliquibus Galliae ecclesiis, Parisiis praesertim. . . ."

Twenty years later, Mabillon (*Mus. Ital.* I, p. 217) says there was one in use at the Benedictine Abbey Church of St. Maur des Fossés near Paris: "hactenus eucharistia columbae inclusa super altare appensa cernitur." It was also seen by Moleon, who adds that it was made of gold: "colombe d'or au lieu de ciboire." (*Voy. Liturg.*, p. 179.)

Another, that hung in the parish church of St. Luperc (Liperche), near to Chartres, is described by Thiers (*Exposit.* I, p. 36, 3): "Elle est de cuivre rouge, émaillée par endroits; vers le milieu du corps elle a comme une petite boëte ronde, creuse environ d'un demy-doit, dorée par le dedans et ouverte pardessus le dos entre les deux aisles avec un petit couvercle de cuivre rouge." He mentions a number of places where *columbae* were once to be seen.

Martène, who cites the passage quoted above from Mabillon, adds: "Similis videtur in Cariacensi congregationis nostrae (that is, of the Maurists) coenobio dioecesi Suessionensi. In monasterio Grandimontensi eucharistia servabatur olim in columba aurea quam Henricus Rex Angliae dederat (*c.* 1184), teste Guadfrido Vosiensi, lib. 22, c. 16." (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. 5, art. 8, § 6.)

[3] See Comper, *Trans. St. Paul's Eccl. Socy.* III, p. 199: "Mr. St. John Hope tells me that he knows of no other mention of a dove in England [than the *columba* in the inventory of Salisbury (1220), see p. 196], and that even contemporary English custom would make it more probable that the early Salisbury pyx was not itself of this form. It is so described as equally to allow the interpretation that the dove was upon the height of the *corona*, as was the pelican at Durham, or holding the pyx in its mouth."

CONDITORIUM.—Mabillon, commenting on the Roman *Ordines*, defines the term *conditorium* as "a thing containing the Eucharist, which is called by several names, *conditorium*, *cophinus*, and *armarium*, in these documents."[1] In the *Ordo Romanus Primus* the word is used of a place in the structure of the church rather than a vessel. For we read that "The Pontiff . . . salutes the *Sancta* and looks to see whether there is more than is wanted; and if so, bids that it shall be placed in the *conditorium*."[2] "Generally," says Ducange, "*conditoria* are underground places."[3]

COPHINUS.—This is defined by Macri as the tabernaculum in which the Eucharist is reserved.[4] The earliest use of the word for this receptacle seems to occur in the *Ordo Romanus* (XV) of Peter Amelius, in the thirteenth century.[5]

CUPA, CUPPA, COPPA, CYPHUS.—Terms in common use after the twelfth century. *Cuppa* occurs, for example, in the works of Matthew Paris. He records the gift of such a vessel for reserving the Eucharist by Henry II to the abbey church of St. Albans: "a most noble and costly *cuppa* . . . and the case (*theca*) immediately containing the Body of Christ."[6] Of the Abbot Eadfrid (*c.* A.D. 941–946) he tells us that "he obtained and offered to the blessed Alban a beautiful *cyphus* . . . for keeping the Body of the Lord."[7] In the history of the Bishops of Auxerre it is

[1] *Comment. in ord. Rom.*, p. cxxxix (*Mus. Ital.* ii): "res eucharistiam continens variis nominibus in libellis nostris (*i.e.* in the *ordines*) conditorium, cophinum, armarium."

[2] *O.R.P.* 8: "Tunc pontifex . . . salutat sancta et contemplatur ut, si fuerit superabundans, praecipiat ut ponatur in conditorio."

[3] *Gloss.* s.v.: "Generatim Conditoria sunt ὑπόγαια, loca depressa, subterranea."

[4] *Hierolexicon*, s.v.: "Tabernaculum in quo eucharistia conservatur."

[5] *O.R.* XV. 51: "deinde idem cardinalis habet incensare altare et cophinum in quo servatur corpus christi." (*Mus. Ital.* II, p. 473.) cf. p. 522, where it appears that the *cophinus* stood on or near the altar: "Papa accedit ad altare et thurificatur et cophinum ubi stat corpus christi."

[6] *Gesta Abbat.*: ". . . unam cuppam nobilissimam ac pretiosissimam in qua reponeretur et ipse theca immediate continens corpus christi." (*R.S.* xxviii. p. 190.)

[7] *ibid.*: "cyphum quendam desiderabilem tam artificio quam materia admirabilem, adquisivit et beato Albano obtulit, ad corpus dominicum reponendum." (*u.s.* p. 20.)

Scudamore notes (*N.E.* p. 910) that "Cuppa was properly a vat or cask

stated that Bishop William de Toucy († 1182) gave to the church of St. Stephen at Auxerre a *cuppa* of four marks weight, most handsomely gilded within and without, for the same purpose.[1]

The Justiciary of Ireland was charged to provide for each cathedral church of that country a *cuppa* for reservation.[2] Other passages illustrating the use of the term are to be found in Ducange,[3] but none make clear whether the *cuppa* was suspended or stood upon or near the altar. One is inclined to suspect, from the absence of any mention of chains in the inventories where the term occurs, that it was a standing receptacle.

The Great Inventory of the ornaments in the vestry of Canterbury Cathedral (1315–1316) contains notice of four *cuppae*, which with other vessels for use at the mass and in reservation are grouped under the heading of *Cuppae* for the Lord's Body.[4] These four vessels were for hanging up over the high altar.

The *Synodal Statutes* of Meaux (1365) contain the direction: "Let there be two *cuppae* or two repositories; to

used in making or for storing wine; while cyphus was often employed for the sconce of similar form, in which lights were set, and which in England was called a candle-vat." This distinction is clear enough for our purpose; a full list of the variant forms of *cuppa* and *cyphus*, and the lines of assimilation between the two series, are given in Ducange, *Gloss. s.vv.*

[1] *de Gest. Episc. Antid.* I.: "cuppam argenteam quatuor marcarum, deintus et deforis peroptime deauratum ad reponendum in ea corpus dominicum." (*P.L.* cxxxviii. 306.)

[2] "mandatum est Justiciario Hiberniae, quod in singulis ecclesiis cathedralibus inveniat unam cuppam ad eucharistiam in ea reponendam." (Prynne, *Liberties of England*, iii. p. 198.) (Cited by Ducange, *s.v.*)

[3] *Glossar. s.v.*: "calicem aureum cum patena ponderis 4 marcarum auri, de quo facta fuit cuppa ad reponendam eucharistiam." (*Necrolog. Eccl. Paris.*): "capsa capitis Apostoli (S. Martialis) manet renovata et copa ubi corpus domini reservatur." (*Chart. S. Mart.*)

[4] "Cuppa I. de auro amalata bogonis de clare"; *i.e.* a vessel of gold enamelled, the gift of Bogo de Clare, Earl of Gloucester. "Item, cuppa I. aurea cum lapide onichino cum pixide aurea in fundo cum I. camau"; *i.e.* another of gold, with an onyx stone, and apparently containing a smaller golden pyx, set with a cameo. "Item, cuppa aurea curta Ludowici regis Francie"; *i.e.* a third, shallow in form, or short stemmed, the gift of St. Louis. "Item, cuppa argentea deaurata cum cistula aurea in fundo"; *i.e.* silver gilt, with a little gold pot inside it. There was also a silver-gilt crown from which the *cuppae* were hung: "Item, corona argentea deaurata circa cuppas." (Legg and Hope, *op. cit.* p. 73.)

wit, one that may remain for keeping the Hosts, another to be carried to the sick." It is apparent from this that *cuppa* was a general term for any suitable vessel.

Another reference of about the same date may be added, in which the name is given to the receptacle in which the *viaticum* was borne to the sick. It occurs in an inventory of la Sainte Chapelle at Paris of the year 1363: "Item, a *coppa* of silver-gilt for carrying the Body of the Lord."[1] The form *coppa* is found again in an extract from an ancient inventory of the goods and gear of a monastic church in Paderborn, where mention is made of "a golden chalice and a paten . . . and a silver *coppa*," which seems to be the vessel used for reservation.[2]

EUCHARISTIALE.—This name is found in some rites for the hallowing of a church and its furniture.[3] See the concluding section of this chapter. *Eucharistia* is used, by mistake for *eucharistiale*, of the pyx in the Life of St. Herluin of Bec, where we are told that at his death no *viaticum* was to be found in the *eucharistia*.[4]

FILITORIUM.—Alexander Neckham, writing about 1130, calls the pyx "the *filitorium*, in which the Eucharist should be most worthily reserved." This is probably a mistake for *phylacterium*.[5]

PERULA.—Is used by Giraldus Cambrensis of the case or satchel in which Celtic priests carried the sacrament about with them.[6]

[1] Ducange, *Gloss. s.v.*: "Item una coppa argentea deaurata ad portandum corpus christi."

[2] *ibid.*: "Aureus calix 1 cum patena . . . coppa 1 argentea." In the Italian edition of Chardon, *Hist. des Sacraments*, the term *coppa coperta* is used to describe the type of vessel that replaced the *turris* (III. xiii. p. 275). For further examples, see Bridgett-Thurston, *op. cit.* pp. 180 f., and Hart and Frere's edition of Rock, *Church of our Fathers*, IV. 234 ff.

[3] Ducange, *Gloss. s.v.*: "vas in quo eucharistia asservatur, in Pontif. Mogunt. MS. fol. 110."

[4] *Vita.* (*P.L.* cl. 711). The monstrance was called a *Eucharist* in Scotland in the sixteenth century. (See Bridgett-Thurston, *op. cit.* pp. 184, 185.)

[5] Bridgett-Thurston, *op. cit.* p. 169 (footnote): "filitorium in quo conservetur dignissime eucharistia." The name *phylacterium* was given to little cases in which amulets and relics were borne upon the person, as well as to the receptacles for relics in churches. It does not appear to be used elsewhere for the vessel containing the sacrament.

[6] *Top. Hib.* ii. 19: "Perula, quam, more patriae, presbyter itinerans sub indumento a collo suspensum deferebat."

PYXIS.—A box, generally of small dimensions. This is the name most usually given to the receptacle of the reserved sacrament during and after the ninth century.[1] Several of the earlier instances of the use of the word in the technical sense have already been given in previous chapters. Of these we may recall its occurrence in the *Capitular* of Hincmar of Reims[2] and in the *Synodical Decrees* of Ratherius of Verona.[3] Regino also provides some early examples,[4] and Æthelwolf tells us that in the abbey church of Lindisfarne there was among other features to be observed the *buxis*, *i.e. pyxis*, containing the gifts of precious life, above or behind the altar.[5] Synods of the eleventh and twelfth centuries make frequent reference to the provision of suitable pyxes. For example, Bishop Odo of Paris (Eudes de Sully) charged his clergy to provide themselves with an ivory pyx that could be securely closed when they carried the sacrament abroad.[6] In the same collection of canons it is remarked of some priests that they had been negligent in providing neither ivory pyx nor a tabernacle, in spite of the fact that definite instructions had been issued requiring them to do so.[7] The pyx of ivory which is here ordered is the box in which the Host was kept, and in which

[1] Great variety of spelling exists. Pyx is sometimes used for the box containing the obleys; *e.g.* "pyxis hostias continens non consecratas." Rupert. Abbat. Tuit. *de incend. oppid.* (*P.L.* clxx. 338); and pyxidula for a reliquary (Leo Marsic. iii. 30).

[2] *Cap. Synod.* II. 8: "quo metallo sit calix et patena . . . aut si habeat (presbyter) pyxidem ubi congrue possit recondi sacra oblatio reservanda ad viaticum infirmis?" (*P.L.* cxxv. 779.)

[3] *Synod. ad presbyt.* I. 6: ". . . buxida cum corpore domini." (*P.L.* cxxxvi. 559.)

[4] *Notitiae* I. 9 and 71. (See p. 193.)

[5] *Carmen de Abb. Lindisf.* 14.

"Haec est illa domus quam mater numinis alti
Incolitans servat vasti sub culmine caeli.
Cui compacta nitet perpulchris mensa tabellis,
Porticus in medio, sancti quam fronde coronant.
Dum buxis claudunt pretiosae munera vitae."
(*P.L.* xcvi. 1337.)

[6] *Constit. Synod.* cap. v. 5: ". . . cum magna reverentia et maturitate . . . in pyxide eburnea bene clausa propter casum." (Hard. vi. 2. 1939.)

[7] *ibid.* praescr. 35: ". . . quidam enim licet jam elapsi sint tres anni ex quo praedictos libellos habuerunt, ita sunt negligentes quod nondum habent pyxidem eburneam nec tabernaculum ubi reservetur cum honore corpus domini. . . ." (*ibid.* 1944.)

it was carried out of the church; the tabernacle was some sort of aumbry. Two pyxes were commonly used in connection with the reserved Eucharist.[1] We may, perhaps, surmise that at first one and the same pyx was used both for storing the sacrament in church and for carrying it forth to sick persons. But both in East and West special vessels of suitable form came into use for the latter purpose.

It is interesting to note that while ivory was at one time the material commonly used in making the pyx,[2] a canon of Verona, writing about 1400, thought that an ivory box was unsuitable for the purpose of reserving the Eucharist, and suggested that a silver vessel, chased without, should be substituted for the receptacle that was then in use. "You have often noticed it," he says, "and judged it to be unworthy of so great a mystery." The use of a silver vessel, according to this writer, "is the general custom of the whole Church of God."[3]

TURRIS.—This was a very early form of vessel, possibly the most primitive of all. Constantine and the Popes, already referred to as donors of *columbae*, included *turres* in their gifts to the Roman churches.[4]

[1] *Regist. S. Osmund*, I. pp. 273–314: "una pixis eburnea dependens super altare cum eucharistia, et alia argentea ponderis iii. solidorum, ad deferendum corpus domini infirmis." (*R.S.* lxxviii. 2.)

Synod. Stat. of Liège (1287) xxxii. 5: "Pyxis in qua corpus domini reservatur vel ad infirmos defertur, eburnea vel argentea, vel ad minus cuprea bene elimata; et semper pannus lineus albus mundus vel sericus infra pyxidem ponatur supra quem corpus domini in pyxide collocetur."

[2] Macri, *Hierolexicon*, s.v.: "Pyxis ventrem virginalem Deiparae symbolice designat; nam in Cant. vii. 2 dicitur, '*venter tuus sicut acervus tritici vallatus liliis*': Graeca lectio habet '*cumulus tritici*'; sed per acervum sive cumulum tritici non nisi Christus sacramentatus intelligitur sub speciebus panis. Item, ubi in vulgata eiusdem Canticae legitur, '*venter eius eburneus*,' cap. v. 14, graece habetur *κοιλία αὐτοῦ ὡς πυξίον ἐλεφάντινον*, id est, *venter eius veluti pyxis eburnea*." If this fanciful interpretation has any antiquity, it may have determined the material of which the pyx was commonly made.

[3] Cited by Mabillon (*Iter Ital.* p. 198).

The "ancient ciboire d'yvoire" which Mabillon (*Voyage Liturg.* p. 68) saw in the monastery at Ferrières and thought "la pièce la plus curieuse," is mentioned again by Martène, who knows of the existence of others no longer in use. Martène also records that the Eucharist used to be kept in a glass vessel in a monastic church near Hildesheim, "ut discimus ex chronico Mindensium c. 45." (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. v. 3, p. 252.)

[4] See *Columba*.

From the sixth century onward these receptacles were in common use. According to St. Germanus of Paris they were made in this shape because the tomb of our Lord was in the form of a tower hewn out of the rock; therefore the Body of the Lord is borne in "towers" at the solemn entry of the *Sancta*.[1]

We need only refer to a few instances in which the *turris* is mentioned. St. Remi of Reims, who died in A.D. 533, desired his successor in the see to carry out the provisions in his will for the making of a tower.[2] Another sixth-century document of the same kind mentions four *turres* and four chalices;[3] and Flodoard, in his *History*, tells of another Bishop of Reims (Lando, † *c.* A.D. 645) who gave a golden *turris* to the cathedral church.[4] We have mentioned more than once already the tower that disengaged itself from the hands of the deacon in the story told by Gregory of Tours.[5]

Venantius Fortunatus wrote a poem on the *turris*, beginning with the lines:

"How fairly made those golden gifts should be
That bear the costly pearl—the hallowed Body of the Lamb!"[6]

These vessels were often richly ornamented, and, as we

[1] *Expositio antiq. Lit. Gall.*: "Corpus vero domini ideo defertur in turribus, quia monumentum domini in similitudinem turris fuit scissum in petra." (*P.L.* lxxii. 93.)

[2] *Test. S. Remigii*: "Jubeo turriculum et imaginatum calicem fabricari." (*P.L.* lxv. 971.)

[3] *Test. S. Aridii*: "turres quatuor, coperturiolos holosericos tres, calices argenteos quatuor." (*P.L.* lxxi. 1147.)

[4] *Hist. Eccl. Remen.* ii. 6. (*P.L.* cxxxv. I. 107.)

[5] *de Gloria Martyr.*, 85: "de diacono cui turris inter manus effugivit." (See p. 78 for text.) Reading *ministerium* for *mysterium*, Thiers and others supposed the *turris* to contain the vessels for mass and the obleys, "ce qui devoit servir à la consecration du corps du Seigneur," but not the sacrament itself. (*Exposit.* pp. 40, 41.) Duchesne (*Chr. Worship*, p. 205 n.) refers to this incident, and says that Krusch, in dealing with the passage, confuses the use of the tower with that of the *capsa*. The *turris*, according to Duchesne, contained the unconsecrated obleys. But compare the direct statement of St. Germanus quoted above.

[6] *Miscell.* iii. carmen 25:

"Quam bene juncta decent, sacrati ut corporis Agni
Margaritum ingens aurea dona ferant."
(*P.L.* lxxxviii. 144.)

The use of "*margaritum*" is of interest in view of the use of the term among the Greeks for the intincted particles prepared for *viaticum*.

have seen, made of costly materials. In the contemporary *Life* of St. Didier of Cahors († A.D. 659) is a passage containing allusions to the splendour of the sacred vessels of the altar, including the "tower."[1]

The use of this sort of receptacle for the sacrament lasted in some French churches until the end of the seventeenth century, and possibly until later. It is interesting to note that in certain cases the *turris* was suspended.

"Up to this date (*i.e.* 1699)," says Martène, "the Eucharist is reserved in a silver *turris* suspended over the altar in the monastery of Marmoutier, at Tours. And up till a few years ago the vessel for exposition of the Eucharist at the parish church of St. Lawrence in Rouen was fashioned in the form of a tower."[2] Thiers tells us that a golden *turris* was hung up under a cross above the altar of a church at Laon;[3] and another was suspended over the high altar of St. Benet's, in Paris, in 1643. Some of them were not very ancient; others, including that in Bourges Cathedral, were of high antiquity.[4]

BENEDICTION OF THE VESSEL OF RESERVATION

From the eighth century comes a form in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* for hallowing the *Chrismal.* A preface to the benediction bids prayer to the end that God Almighty will "vouchsafe to fill the receptacle of the Body of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, with blessing, with the safeguard of

[1] *Vita* 17: "fulgent quidem gemmis auroque calices, praeminent turres, micant coronae, resplendent candelabra. . . ." (Krusch, *M.G.H. Vitæ*, iv. 576.)

[2] "In maiori monasterio Turonensi hactenus (*i.e.* 1699) in turre argentea in altari suspensa eucharistia asservatur. In Rotomagensi etiam S. Laurentii ecclesia parochiali ante paucos annos vas eucharistiae ostensorium in turris similitudinem erat efformatum." (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. v. § 3.)

[3] *Exposit.*, p. 42.

[4] "Enfin, il y en avoit où l'Eucharistie estoit dans des tabernacles appelez Tours, parsqu'ils estoient fabriquez en forme de Tours, dont les uns estoient proche les autels, comme j'en ay vû de cuivre qui me parut assez ancien, au costé gauche du choeur de l'église paroissiale de S. Michael de Dijon, éloigné environ de huit ou dix pas du maistre autel; et les autres au dessus de la croix que l'on met ordinairement au haut des principaux autels des églises. Ces Tabernacles en forme de Tours sout assez renommez dans l'antiquité." (*ibid.*, pp. 39, 40.)

sanctification, and with the power of defence." And then follows the benediction itself, in which the *chrismal* is termed "a new sepulchre of the Body of Christ."[1] This is repeated in the *Missale Francorum.*[2] Very similar is the form given in Ménard's text of the "*Gregorian*" *Sacramentary* and in allied documents.[3] The *Gallican Sacramentary* (*Missale Vesontionense*) provides a form of joint benediction of chalice, paten, and *turris.*[4]

In other forms the terms *vasculum eucharistiale, eucharistiale vas*, etc., are used to designate the pyx.[5]

[1] "Oremus, fratres carissimi, ut Deus omnipotens hoc ministerium corporis filii sui domini nostri Jesu Christi gerulum, benedictione, sanctificationis tutamine, defensionis dominatione implere dignetur, orantibus nobis. Per dominum. *Or.* Omnipotens Deus Trinitas inseparabilis, manibus nostris opem tuae benedictionis infunde; ut per nostram benedictionem hoc vasculum sanctificetur et corporis Christi novum sepulchrum Spiritus Sancti gratia perficiatur. Per dominum." (Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 135, 136.) For the idea contained in *novum sepulchrum corporis Christi* cf. the name sometimes given to the Russian kovtcheg, or kivot (p. 252), and St. Germain's description of the *turris* (p. 217).

[2] *P.L.* lxxii. 330.

[3] In the *orders* for sacring churches and church furniture and ornaments, printed by Martène (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* II. 13), are benedictions of the pyx, which is described by various names: "Benedictio eucharistialis vasculi. Oremus dilectissimi et fratres carissimi, ut Deus omnipotens hoc mysteriale (*scil.* ministeriale) corporis Filii sui . . . gerulum," etc. (*ord.* iii): ". . . ut hoc vasculum sanctificetur . . ." (*ord.* iv): *Vas*, in *ord.* vii. The first two are English documents. In the *Leofric Missal* also a variant of the Gelasian prayer is given, under the title *Consecratio chrismalis.*

[4] "*Benedictio calicis et patenae et turris.* Deus omnipotens qui cum Moyse famulo tuo in Chore montem servanda populo tuo praecepta disponeres, templum sanctum tuum qualiter aedificaret, instituisti; precamur [te], Domine, tuam maiestatem ut hunc calicem patenam et turrem, in quo celebraturi sumus sacrosancta mysteria, caelesti benedictione sanctifices atque benedicas, ut sanctis vasculis tuis acceptabilem deferat famulatum. Per." (Neale and Forbes, *Ancient Liturgies of Gallican Church*, p. 362.)

[5] Martène, *u.s.*

CHAPTER XV

The Minister of the Reserved Eucharist

THE circumstances that made the presbyter the celebrant at mass in the bishop's stead made him the custodian and normal minister of the reserved Eucharist. These were, briefly, the subdivision of the city areas for disciplinary and administrative purposes; the spread of Christianity from the towns to the country-side; and, later, the development, from churches attached to isolated districts and estates, of the regular parochial system of the middle ages. All these causes conspired to produce and to conserve presbyteral autonomy in matters connected with the sacraments. We may take note that, long before this development had come to its full growth, the control of *viaticum* had been placed by some bishops in the hands of the presbyterate, even as early as the fourth century. At Alexandria at that date it appears to have been usual to apply to the priest for communion in sickness;[1] and from the same area come the ancient *canons* that bear the name of Athanasius, in which administration of *viaticum* is assumed to be a duty of the presbyterate.[2]

To trace here the history of the presbyter's control of the reserved Eucharist would be tedious and unnecessary. It is, as we have just remarked, the natural accompaniment of his increased independence of the bishop. But what is of interest and calls for some notice is the fact, that in certain circumstances clerks of inferior order and even lay folk might act as ministers of the reserved sacrament. In this matter the same principle was followed as that which regulated the administration of baptism and unction and the hearing of confession. In case of urgent necessity,

[1] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 44.

[2] *Can.* 36: "No priest shall carry forth the mysteries and go with them about the streets except for a sick man, when the end and death's hour of need draw nigh," etc. (Riedel and Crum, *Canons of Athanasius*, p. 32.)

if the priest were absent, an inferior clerk might officiate in his place; and if no clerk of any degree were at hand the layman, and even the laywoman, might take the duty upon himself or herself.[1]

In this chapter we consider the administration of the Eucharist by other agents than the bishop and the presbyter.

A. The Deacon

Justin Martyr's account of the Liturgy furnishes good evidence for the administration of the two eucharistic species by the hands of the deacons to present and absent alike;[2] and so long as the custom of sending the sacrament abroad from the Liturgy continued in general use, the deacons were doubtless the ministers by whom it was conveyed and administered.

They still appear to communicate the laity in both kinds in the East in the fourth century,[3] and there is some ground for supposing that elsewhere, at any rate, they had so far exceeded their functions as to celebrate the Eucharist under stress of circumstances.[4] However this may be, the

[1] For a mediaeval discussion of this principle, see Giraldus Cambrensis (*Gemma Ecclesiast.* I. 2): Utrum per laicum infirmis mitti eucharistia vel extrema fieri unctio possit (*R.S.* xxi. 2, p. 13). He says, "intelligendum autem nisi ingruente necessitate; quia tunc si presbyter id forte per se implere non poterit, per diaconum vel etiam laicum fidelem illud adimpleat, sicut et baptizandi officium et etiam extremae unctionis infirmorum," quoting in support of his statement certain "Isidorian" decrees. (*ibid.*, p. 14.)

[2] See p. 17.

[3] There may be a reference to the administration of the two species by the deacon in the second canon of Ancyra (A.D. 314). The relevant part of the text is as follows: "διακόνους ὁμοίως θύσαντας . . . τὴν μὲν ἄλλην τιμὴν ἔχειν, πεπαῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν ἢ κηρύσσειν . . ." (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des. Conciles* I, pt. i, p. 303.) "They shall no more offer bread and cup" after they have lapsed. Does this mean to the celebrant at the offertory, or to the communicants after consecration?

[4] Arles (A.D. 314), *can.* 15: "de diaconibus quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit minime fieri debere." This may, perhaps, allude to the possibility that during the Diocletian persecutions some deacons had even assumed the right to celebrate where there were neither bishops nor priests left. *Offerre* is used in *can.* 19 for celebrating: "de episcopis peregrinis, qui in urbem solent venire, placuit eis locum dare ut *offerant*." Binterim interprets the canon as forbidding the deacons to administer

canon of Nicaea that forbids the deacon to communicate the presbyters with the consecrated Bread, on the ground that such a practice was contrary to the canons and to established usage, says nothing about the restriction of their ministry, in this particular, in communicating the layfolk.[1] Deacons continue to administer both elements in the Rite contained in the *Testament of our Lord*, as well in the congregation as to the sick. But a priest must carry the sacrament to an invalid priest, and it is interesting to note that a deaconess acted in the same capacity in the case of a sick woman.[2] Deacons were, moreover, the original ministers by whom, in early days, the *Fermentum* was carried from the bishop to the district churches in a city, and their association with the ceremony of the *Sancta* lasted for some time.[3]

But, in some parts of the Church, the office of the deacon at the open communion was already limited to the administration of the chalice before the middle of the third century. Like all other such modifications of ecclesiastical usage, this restriction was of local and gradual growth. That it was the custom of the African Church in his age seems to be a just deduction from a description of communion in the works of Cyprian.[4] But that wider powers were still exercised by this order of the ministry is apparent from his allowing the deacons to reconcile the penitent in case of necessity; and this office would normally carry with it, as we have seen,

Holy Communion in other churches than those to which they were attached. Cyprian (*de Lapsis* 25) uses the phrase calicem *offerre* in this sense. (See Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 291 ff, and Vacant-Mangenot, *Dct. de Théol. Cathol.*, s.v. Diacres, col. 717.) Laodicea (?363), *can.* 25: "ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτας ἄρτον διδόναι οὐδὲ ποτήριον εὐλογεῖν." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, pt. 2, p. 1013.)

[1] *Can.* 18: "ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην σύνοδον, ὅτι ἐν τισι τόποις καὶ πόλεσι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οἱ διάκονοι διδόασιν, ὅπερ οὔτε ὁ κανὼν οὔτε ἡ συνήθεια παρέδωκε, τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν τοῖς προσφέρουσι διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ χριστοῦ· κἀκεῖνο δὲ ἐγνωρίσθη, ὅτι ἤδη τινὲς τῶν διακόνων καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἅπτονται. . ." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, pt. i, p. 610.)

[2] See p. 19. "Si quis fidelium morbi causa domi maneat, diaconus ipsi deferat sacrificium."

[3] See chap. vii.

[4] *de Lapsis* 25: "sollemnibus adinpletis calicem diaconus offerre praesentibus coepit." (Hartel, p. 225.)

the administration of the sacrament out of time of celebration.[1]

It is clear from the language of various canons and decrees that in some parts of the Church, at least, the deacons were in the habit of magnifying their office to an inordinate extent. This was especially the case, we may suppose, where the primitive tradition of their close association with the bishop was strong. The pride of the deacons at Rome and elsewhere was not an unusual subject of complaint.[2] We note accordingly from the fourth century onward a general tendency to define very carefully and to restrict the deacon's rights. This check was made all the more possible by the rise of minor orders to which certain of his duties were assigned.[3]

Yet the association of the deacon with the celebration of the Eucharist persisted,[4] and from the language of early ecclesiastical writers we gather that whatever restrictions were laid upon the order in this matter were regarded as disciplinary measures only. Thus we are able to account for the language of Isidore of Seville, who remarks that just as consecration of the Eucharist is the presbyter's privilege, so the administration of the sacrament was that of the deacon.[5] His words reappear in works of Rabanus Maurus,[6] and are the source from which is derived an ancient English canon directing the deacon to housel the

[1] *Ep.* xiv. 5 (Hartel, p. 512); *Ep.* xvi. 9 (p. 520); *Ep.* xvii. 11 (p. 522); *Ep.* xviii. 12 (p. 524). cf. Synod. Elvira, *can.* 32. (Hefele-Leclercq, I. i, p. 238.)

[2] cf. Arles, *can.* 18: "de diaconibus urbicis, ut non sibi tantum praesumant, sed honorem presbyteris reservent, ut sine conscientia ipsorum nihil tale faciant." (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, p. 293.) cf. Van Espen, *Commentarius in canones et decreta* (1755), p. 101. The Nicene canon (18) dealing with this matter was introduced by the Roman representatives. (Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, p. 613).

[3] Epiphanius (*Haeres.* lxxix. 4) says that no deacon must be allowed to have control of a sacrament (μυστήριον ἐπιμελεῖν).

[4] cf. St. Ambrose's expression concerning St. Lawrence, archdeacon of Rome (*De Off. Min.* I. 41). This may relate to the ceremony of the *Sancta*. The deacon administers the chalice to the bishop (pontiff) on Maundy Thursday in the "Gregorian" sacramentary.

[5] *de Eccles. Officiis* II. 8: "nam sicut in sacerdote, consecratio, ita in ministro dispensatio sacramenti est. . . . Ille oblata sanctificat, hic sanctificata dispensat." (Hittorp, 208.)

[6] *de Cleric. instit.* I. 7. (*P.L.* cvii. 303.)

people, without any statement concerning his limitation to the ministry of the chalice.[1]

After the restriction of his office at the Liturgy the deacon was still allowed in special circumstances to act as the priest's representative or substitute in conveying the reserved sacrament to the sick. A ninth-century canon authorizes his employment in this capacity in case of need. "Just as none but bishops and priests may offer the sacrifice, since to them alone are given the keys of the heavenly kingdom, so also none but they must meddle with the discipline of penitents. But if necessity arise, and no presbyter be present, let the deacon admit the penitent to Holy Communion."[2] It is the deacon who carries the *viaticum*, in the presence of the priest, in an eleventh-century *Sacramentary of Narbonne*,[3] though it is the latter who administers it to the invalid.

The numerous enactments that deal with the question in the twelfth century and after are witness, not to the sudden revival of an ancient custom, but to an effort to restrain within due bounds what had been a constar practice, and to confine the exercise of this liberty to cases of special urgency. Two or three of these canons will serve to illustrate the policy. At the Council of Westminster (1138) it was declared that although under normal conditions the priest himself was to carry the Host to those who asked for *viaticum*, the deacon or even a layman in case of necessity might act for him.[4] Of similar import is the decree put forth at Paris sixty years later: "Priests are not to let the deacons take the sacrament to the sick, except

[1] *Canones Ælfric*, 16: "He may baptize children and housel the people." (Thorpe, p. 444.)

[2] Regino, I. 295: "Sicut sacrificium offerre non debent nisi episcopi et presbyteri, quibus claves regni caelestis traditae sunt, sic nec poenitentium judicia alii usurpare debent. Si autem necessitas evenerit et presbyter non fuerit praesens, diaconus suscipiat poenitentem ad sanctam communionem." (*P.L.* cxxxii. 247.)

[3] "Dum autem unguendus est infirmus celebret pro eo missam sacerdos. Deinde convenientibus omnibus veniat et ipse cum portione corporis et sanguinis domini, quam portet levita." (Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. 4, ord. 13.) See p. 236 n.

[4] *Can.* 2: "Sancimus etiam ut ultra octo dies corpus Christi non reservetur; neque ad infirmos, nisi per sacerdotem aut per diaconum, aut necessitate instante per quemlibet cum summa reverentia deferatur." (Hard. vi. 2. 1204.)

in case of necessity, when the priest himself is away; and the bishops shall reprove those who do not observe this order."[1] Bishop William of Angers directed the Synod that sat in his diocese in 1273 on the same principle; and it was prescribed at a Synod of Nîmes (1284) that the deacon might undertake this duty only by express injunction of the parish priest. In his absence or disability, if there were immediate and urgent need, it was not necessary to obtain his permission.[2] The *articulus necessitatis* must often have arisen during the terrible pestilences, such as the Black Death, that swept over Europe from time to time.

B. The Subdeacon and Clerks in Minor Orders

The subdeacon is apparently associated with the administration of the Eucharist to the sick in some accounts of monastic customs. Martène refers to cases, in which permission was conceded to the subdeacon to act as minister of *viaticum*, that are recorded in documents belonging to a Benedictine house at Chezal-Benoît.[3] But it may be that the "subdeacon" implies one of the sacred ministers at the mass, who may have been in priest's orders.[4]

With the mention of the *mansionarii* or sextons who in the ninth century carried the *fermentum* from the Pope's

[1] *Cap.* v. 5: "Non permittant presbyteri diacones (comminatur episcopus eis qui hoc non servant) deferre infirmis sacrosanctum corpus domini, nisi necessitate cum sacerdos absens fuerit. . . ." (Hard. vi. 2. 1939.) So also Councils of York (1195), Westminster (1200), and of Rouen (1231).

[2] IV: "ne aliquis qui non sit in presbyterium ordinatus eucharistiam communicantibus praebeat. . . . Diaconus hoc facere potest de licentia sacerdotis ubi idem sacerdos hoc per se non potest facere, vel quia absens est presbyter ut necessitatis articulus noscitur imminere et in ultimo casu non est necessaria licentia sacerdotis." (Hard. vii. 914.)

[3] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. v. 2: "In duobus MSS. codicibus monasterii Casalis Benedicti, quorum unus ab annis 600 et alter ab annis 300, in quibus describitur ordo ad visitandum infirmum, subdiaconus ad infirmum eucharistiam deferre legitur, sed eam ministrare sacerdos jubetur, qui nunc solus et defert et praebet." He also cites instances of the deacon administering *viaticum* in religious houses. "corpus autem domini potest infirmus accipere a procuratore si sit diaconus." (*Stat. Antiq. Cartusiens.*)

[4] As, for example, in a monastic *ordo ad infirmum visitandum* of Fleury: "id est post expletionem missae exuet se presbyter casula. Quem praecedet subdiaconus cum eucharistia et ministri cum candelabris et thuribulo," etc. (Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* III. xv. ord. 1.)

mass to the district churches, and of the *acolythi* who at the same period appear to have discharged this duty also as well as to have brought in the *Sancta* at the Introit,[1] we may pass on to consider the ministration of the reserved Eucharist by the laity.

THE RELIGIOUS

That monks were allowed to administer the reserved Eucharist to each other and to the laity is clear from the instances we have collected out of the lives of the Irish saints and from other sources.[2] There is no need to repeat the evidence here.

As to women in religion, they too were allowed to make use of the reserved sacrament, and in case of need to administer the communion to the dying. The deaconesses in the *Testament of our Lord*, though not technically religious, and the companions of St. Odilia, may be cited as instances from different parts of Christendom at different periods.

C. THE LAITY

At no time was the distribution of the sacraments at the Liturgy performed by any person except such as were in ecclesiastical orders. But, out of mass-time, the free-dom conceded in private reservation allowed lay folk to act as the bearers and ministers of the reserved Eucharist. It was necessary, therefore, after the habit of private com-munion had come under the ban of authority, to forbid the continuation of any customs to which private reservation had given origin, and to prohibit the laity from carrying the Eucharist any longer to their sick friends. The early legislation that deals with private reservation (reviewed in chap. iv) more or less directly condemned lay administration of communion to the sick; and the ruling of the council, commonly called "*in Trullo*," in forbidding this practice whenever regular officials of the Church were present,[3]

[1] Atchley, O.R.P., p. 128: Duchesne, *Chr. Worship*, Append. I.

[2] See chap. v. Many Celtic monks were in holy orders.

[3] *Can.* 58: "μηδεὶς τῶν ἐν λαϊκοῖς τεταγμένων ἑαυτῷ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταδιδότω παρόντος ἐπισκόπου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου ἢ διακόνου. . ."

authorized the policy that since that date (A.D. 681) has generally prevailed.[1]

Mediaeval canonists and others made reference from time to time to an injunction that was commonly assigned to a seventh-century Council of Rouen or Reims. In this canon note is taken of certain irregularities in connection with the consumption of what remains of the Eucharist after mass; and it is also particularly enjoined upon the celebrant that the Eucharist should be placed, not in the hand, but in the mouth of the lay-communicant. No reason is explicitly given for this method of reception, but from the context it seems to be intended to prevent the un-authorized use, or even the abuse, of the sacrament.[2]

During the ninth century we meet with a number of injunctions against lay-administration; from which circum-stance it appears that the custom of permitting the Eucharist to be carried away from church was a common irregularity at this period. Hincmar of Reims required the presbyters of his diocese to visit the sick and to give them communion with their own hands. They were not to let the lay folk do this for them.[3] Regino of Prüm preserves an enquiry

(Hard. III. 1684.) This cannot, of course, refer to distribution of the Eucharist at the Liturgy, where the clergy would of necessity be present. cf. *Can.* 101, forbidding reception in metal boxes.

[1] Florinus (*de Sacr. Ord.* xii. 3, § 12) cites Balsamon as asserting, "morem istum fuisse apud Latinos suo tempore (*i.e.* twelfth century) vulgatum, laicosque non modo in sinu gestasse, sed etiam aliis distribuisse." He adds, "sed hoc unde acceperit, nescio."

[2] *Can.* 2: "Dictum est nobis quod quidam presbyteri celebrata missa, detrectantes ipsi sumere divina mysteria quae consecrarunt, calicem domini mulierculis, quae ad missas offerunt, tradant, vel quibusdam laicis qui dijudicare corpus domini nesciunt,—id est, discernere inter cibum spiritualem atque carnalem. Quod quantum sit omni ecclesiasticae religioni contrarium pietas fidelium novit. Unde omnibus presbyteris interdicimus ut nullus in posterum hoc facere praesumat, sed aut ipse cum reverentia sumat, et diacono aut subdiacono, qui ministri altaris sunt, colligenda tradat. Illud etiam attendat ut eos propria manu communicet: nulli autem laico aut feminae eucharistiam in manibus ponat, sed tantum in os ejus cum his verbis ponat: *corpus et sanguis domini prosit tibi ad remissionem peccatorum et ad vitam aeternam.* Si quis haec transgressus fuerit, quia Deum omnipotentem contemnit, et quanto in ipso est, inhonorat, ab altare removeatur." (Hard. vi. 1. 205); under title *Rodomi Synodus Generalis*, and dated A.D. 878. For discussion of date, etc., see Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.* III. 1. p. 287. Note the implication of intinction in the directions for communicating the laity.

[3] *Synod.* II. 10: "Si ipse presbyter visitet infirmos et inungat oleo sancto, et communicet per se et non per quemlibet; et ille communicet

to the same effect;[1] and a canon of a ninth-century council of Reims has a strongly-worded prohibition of the usage.[2]

In the next century we find the edict of Ratherius of Verona: "No one shall presume to give the communion to a layman or to a woman, to take it to invalids."[3] The Council of Lanciano (Ansanum) repeats the prohibition (890).[4]

Later councils and synods as a rule allowed the laity to carry the Eucharist to the dying in cases of extreme necessity. It is permitted, for example, by the council of Westminster in 1138,[5] and by other synods of which we have already taken note.[6] Bishop Walter of Rouen, in his charge concerning ecclesiastical discipline, probably meant to allow a similar liberty.[7] We may also recall the ambiguous passage in the so-called *Penitential of Bede*,[8] in which lay administration is possibly implied, and the Irish law of Senchus Mor, which guarantees exemption from arrest and

populum nec tradat communionem cuiquam laico ad deferendum in domum suam causa cujuslibet infirmi." (*P.L.* cxxv. 779.)

[1] *Notitiae* I: "Si visitet infirmos . . . si eos propria manu communicet et non per quemlibet laicum; aut si tradat communionem laico aut feminae ad deferendum infirmis, quod est nefas?"

[2] In Regino (*De discipl. Eccles.* I. 121): "Pervenit ad notitiam nostram quod quidam presbyteri in tantum parvi pendant divina mysteria ut laico aut feminae sacrum corpus domini tradant ad deferendum infirmis; et quibus prohibetur ne sacrarium ingrediantur, nec ad altare appropinquant, illis sancta sanctorum committantur, quod quam sit horribile quamque detestabile omnium religiosorum animadvertit prudentia. Igitur, interdicit per omnia Synodus ne talis temeraria praesumptio ulterius fiat; sed omni modo presbyter per semetipsum infirmum communicet: quod si fecerit aliter gradus sui periculo subjacebit."

[3] *Synod. ad presbyteros* I. 7: "nullus praesumat tradere communionem laico aut feminae ad deferendum infirmo." (*P.L.* cxxxvi. 560.)

[4] The text, as given by Martène and Durand (*Thesaur. Anecdot.* iv. 75), is imperfect: ". . . ac vetaverunt a nullo homine corpus et sanguinem [por]tare ad infirmum nisi sacerdotis solius."

[5] *Can.* 2: "Sancimus etiam ut . . . corpus Christi . . . neque ad infirmos nisi per sacerdotem aut per diaconum, aut necessitate instante per quemlibet cum summa reverentia deferatur." (Hard. vi. 2. 1204.)

[6] See above under section, *the Deacon.*

[7] *Cap.* 3: "Placuit etiam ne corpus dominicum sine luminari, cruce et aqua benedicta, sive de die, sive de nocte deferatur: nec sine sacerdotis praesentia, nisi summa necessitas sacerdotem excusaverit." (Hard. vi. 2. 1905.)

[8] Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* p. 329.

distress to any person going to fetch the communion for a sick man.[1] Allusions to the irregular use of the sacrament by lay folk occur in some of the stories of miraculous Hosts in which certain mediaeval writers abound. Giraldus Cambrensis, for instance, has a tale about a woman of Arras, to whom the priest, supposing she wished to take it to an invalid, gave at Eastertide a Host which she afterwards mislaid.[2]

With the later western regulations it is interesting to compare the parallel usage of the Syrian Jacobites in the times of James of Edessa (*c.* A.D. 700). The substance of such parts of the *Nomocanon* as deal with this question are given in *La Perpetuité de la Foy.* It is not possible to determine from the translations there given whether the Host alone or the dessicated conjoint sacrament was used.[3] "Portions of the Eucharist must not be given to every one who asks for it to take away to his house, unless it is for an invalid. In that case the clergy shall take it. If there is no ecclesiastic available the sacred mysteries may be sent by the hand of godly laymen, or even of a faithful woman. They are to be placed in quite clean linen (or cotton), or in paper which must be burnt afterwards; or a vine-leaf may be used, or white bread, which shall subsequently be eaten. If the priest has to carry the mysteries to any great distance, and goes on horseback, he must not place them in a bag upon the animal, but must bear them on his own shoulders. The sick person shall receive the communion in his mouth; but if he so desire, he may receive it in his hand and himself convey it to his mouth. If he be in such a condition that he cannot perform this for himself, whoever brought the mysteries shall act as ministrant."[4]

The same principle is stated more briefly in another

[1] Warren, *Liturgy of Celtic Church*, p. 138.

[2] *Gemma Ecclesiast* I. 11: "In Francorum itaque regno, urbe videlicet Atrabatensi, quae comitatus Hundriae caput esse solet, die quodam Paschali, matrona quaedam hostiam consecratam quasi infirmo deferendam, sibi per sacerdotis incuriam incaute traditam, in capite pepli cujusdam serici nodatam in cista reposuit," etc. (*R.S.* xxi. 2. p. 40.)

[3] The authors of *La Perpetuité de la Foy* contend that the single species of Bread is meant; but their work is a polemic against a Protestant minister's assertions concerning the customs and faith of the Eastern Churches.

[4] *op. cit.* iii. 7. (Vol. IV, p. 257); viii. 2. (Vol. V, p. 564).

constitution of the same authority: "If no priest be present, and the Eucharist is to be had, the faithful laity, and even women, may take it in their hands and place it in (a sick person's) mouth; especially if the receptacle in which it is kept be very deep."[1]

Somewhat earlier in date than these is an injunction assigned to John of Telala, which is to the same effect: "The Eucharist shall be taken to a sick person in paper, or in a linen cloth which must afterwards be burnt; or else in a little box (or basket) which must be brought again to the altar. In case of urgent necessity, the Eucharist may be sent by the hand of a faithful layman, or of a woman."[2]

[1] *ibid.* viii. 2 (*u.s.*). [2] *ibid.* iii. 7 (*u.s.*); viii. 2 (*u.s.*).

CHAPTER XVI

THE RITE OF CLINICAL COMMUNION

IN the first ages of the Church there were good reasons why the Eucharist should be borne with as little publicity as possible to those who were in need of it; and even after the persecutions had passed away, ceremonial would develop slowly in connection with this rite. For administration of the sacrament to the sick, except where it was the extension of public communion by distribution abroad, was always an extra-liturgical rite, an occasional *officium*; and so lay outside the stream of influences that produced the elaborate and dramatic ceremonies of the Liturgy. If we exclude the special masses that were exceptionally permitted in sick rooms, we have nothing but the barest outlines given for nearly eight hundred years.

The rite of clinical communion with the reserved Eucharist falls naturally into two parts. First, the bearing forth of the sacrament to the sick person; and secondly, the actual administration.

The latter is the essential part of the rite, and, of course, the earliest to develop. A certain amount of external reverence accompanied the act of communion from the Eucharist privately reserved; but for long it would seem that this consisted of nothing more than private devotions and such simple ceremonies as were the natural outcome of piety. Occasionally, as we have seen, devout persons would ask for instruction as to how they might communicate at home in an edifying and reverent manner.[1]

When the reserved sacrament was borne to the sick by the officials of the Church, the prayers would doubtless become regularized and fixed, while the act of delivery to the invalid would be accompanied by the words of

[1] See chap. v, p. 53.

administration usual at the public communion. Prayer for worthy reception, some act of faith, possibly a lection,[1] the words of delivery, a thanksgiving, and a blessing would doubtless be the main elements of the office. Moreover, we must bear in mind that from early times the administration of clinical communion was closely associated with confession of sin and the sacrament of unction.

As for the bearing forth of the reserved Eucharist, we have again no definite information until, at the end of the eighth century, regular offices for communion of the sick suddenly appear, in the mixed sacramentaries that were the result of blending with Pope Hadrian's "Gregorian" sacramentary greater or less quantities of material from the service books of the Gallican Church.

The sudden appearance of these full rites for the visitation, unction, and communion of the sick is remarkable, for it seems that Hadrian's exemplar itself contained no such office. From what sources the material was drawn remains for the present a matter of speculation; for the seventh or eighth century form of the "Gelasianum" contains merely a few prayers for the recovery of a sick person,[2] and the Mozarabic books provide no clue.[3] Either these rites were largely a new liturgical feature, or the Carolingian reformers had at their command provincial or diocesan uses of which no independent traces remain.

In the sacramentary of St. Remi of Reims we have, as was pointed out in chapter ix, a very early example

[1] The Mozarabic texts include a *Lectio de uno infirmo* (Férotin, *Liber ordinum*, 722). The early Celtic orders (*e.g. The Stowe Missal*) contain short lections. There are more provided in the typical "Gregorian" sacramentaries.

[2] III. 69: "*oratio super infirmum in domo*"; four prayers subjoined: [III. 70: "*Item orationes ad missam pro infirmum*" (sic)]: III. 71: "*oratio pro reddita sanitate*," one prayer subjoined: III. 72: "*orationes intrantibus in domo* (sic), *sive benedictio*," four prayers subjoined: III. 73: "*Item orationes ad missas*," see p. 27 above: III. 74: "*orationes super venientes in domo*" (sic): III. 75: "*Benedictio aquae spargendae in domo*": III. 76: "*Item alia*," containing "*orationes pro aspersione aquae*." (Wilson, *Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 281–288.) Not all of these relate to visitation of the sick; and none contain any reference to the Eucharist.

[3] Two offices "*De infirmis*" are given in Férotin, *op. cit.*, 877, 878. They consist of prayers, hymns, responses, and blessings.

of these mixed texts,[1] and the order for the visitation, unction, and communion of the sick therein prescribed may be taken as the type characteristic of service books with a "Gregorian" ancestry.

The rite is drawn up for use in connection with a cathedral or capitular church of the usual sort, and opens with a rubric to the following effect: "When the priest goes into a sick person's house, holy water having been prepared, '*Peace be unto this house*' is first said thrice by those who enter. Holy water is sprinkled, with the odour of frankincense (*thymiama*) or of other incense," while a psalm, with its antiphon and a prayer or prayers for a blessing on the house are repeated. On coming into the sick man's presence, the priest says, "'*Thou hast called (me)*'; and the invalid is to answer, '*I have wished to speak with thee, that thou mayest impart to me penance and remission of sins.*' The priest says, '*May the Lord Jesus Christ give thee pardon; yet if God will regard thee, wilt thou retain it*' (*i.e.* the pardon given)? '*I will retain it*,' the sick man shall reply."

Then the priest hears his confession, either written or spoken, as best serves the purpose of examination; makes a cross of ashes on the sick person's breast, and draws a sackcloth over his head. The seven penitential psalms are recited, and after a short prayer follows a litany of the usual type. We may pass over without further remark, as alien to our subject, that part of the *ordo* that deals with the shriving and unction, and come to the communion. After a prayer of reconciliation, the sackcloth is removed, and Psalms cxx–cxxiii, cxxv, with their antiphons, having been repeated, the priest is instructed to say, "*May the Lord have mercy upon all thine iniquities*," etc., and then to give the communion: "*The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thee to life eternal. The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ redeem thee to life eternal. The peace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the communion of saints be with thee and with us to eternal life. Amen.*" Then, following a prayer, comes the rubric, to which we have made reference before, which directs a repetition throughout the week or even longer, if need be, of these

[1] An abstract of Ménard's text is given at the end of this chapter. Document A.

ministrations; and the recitation, on the invalid's behalf, of the canonical choir offices. Prayers for use by the priest, or rather for the priests (a number are supposed to be in attendance), and blessings to be given by the bishop, if he be present, are provided. The whole office is very long, and as we noted in chapter ix, in cases of severe sickness, other much shorter orders are to be used.[1]

It will be noticed that, although a regular procession is contemplated, and holy water and incense are expressly ordered, no mention is made in the rubrics of the processional cross or of lights, both of which, for long before this date, had been common features of an ecclesiastical procession.[2]

A light is ordered to precede the sacrament borne to the sick by a canon which earlier writers, after Burchard, assigned to a council of Reims in A.D. 630, but later authorities consider that it probably belongs to some synod of the ninth century. The Eucharist is to be carried in a fair vessel.[3]

A cross and holy water, and the presence of three priests are required by the early ninth-century (*c.* A.D. 821) *capitulare* of Theodulf of Orleans, in which it is expected that the invalid shall, if possible, be brought to the church, newly washed and clad in white.[4]

A long commentary upon unction is inserted, containing, among other things, practical directions for the administration of this rite, and then follow these notes upon the communion: "After the sick person has been anointed with prayer, he shall be told to say the Lord's prayer and the creed, and to commend his spirit into the hands of God, to fortify himself with the sign of the cross, and to say farewell to the living. Then the priest shall

[1] Document B. at end of this chapter.

[2] Atchley, *History of the Use of Incense* (Alcuin Club Collect. xiii), pp. 155 ff.

[3] *Can.* 10: "Feratur (eucharistia) aegrotis vase honesto et lumine antecedente et praeeunte." (Hard. iii. 575.)

[4] "Primitus autem infirmo poenitentia detur. Deinde, si permiserit infirmitas, abluto corpore, albis vestibus induatur, et in ecclesiam deportetur, et jaceat in cilicio superjecto cinere. Portetur ibi crux et aqua benedicta, ut cum venerint ad eum, videlicet tres presbyteri, dicant capitulum: *pax huic domui et omnibus habitantibus in ea,*" etc. (*P.L.* cv. 220.)

give him the peace and communicate him [evidently with the reserved conjoint species] saying, *The Body and Blood of the Lord be to thee for remission of all thy sins, and preserve thee to eternal life.* Then after prayer let the priest in conclusion say, *Let us bless the Lord.* To which all reply, *Thanks be to God,* and so it is finished. On the morrow and for seven days the priest shall visit him, and shall pour forth over him prayers suitable to the case."[1]

From the next century comes the pontifical that bears the name of Prudentius of Troyes, wherein the preliminary use of holy water and incense is prescribed by a rubric[2] that with trifling variations is common to a number of orders of the tenth-century and later date.[3] A Moissac sacramentary shows us the capitular body going in procession towards the house of a sick person, chanting the penitential psalms, but it does not tell us what ornaments were carried, nor whether incense was to be used. Holy water, blessed at the house, is ordered.[4]

The sign of the cross is made at the door by the priest in an *ordo* from Noyon.[5]

An early eleventh-century pontifical of Narbonne bids mass to be said to provide *viaticum.* At the conclusion of the service a procession forms in the church, and with a good deal of ceremony makes its way to the dwelling where

[1] "Uncto vero infirmo cum orationibus, ut dictum est, jubeatur a sacerdote orationem dominicam et symbolum dicere et spiritum suum in manus Dei commendare et signaculo crucis se munire et viventibus valedicere. Tunc sacerdos det ei pacem et communicet eum, dicens: *corpus et sanguis domini sit tibi remissio omnium peccatorum tuorum et custodiat te in vitam aeternam.* Tunc data oratione, in fine dicat sacerdos: *benedicamus domino.* Et respondeant omnes: *Deo gratias,* et expletum est. In crastino et usque ad septem dies visitet eum sacerdos, et fundat super eum orationes ad hoc congruentes." (*P.L.* cv. 222.)

[2] "Cum ingreditur sacerdos ad visitandum infirmum, primum dicat *pax huic domui* (ter). et resp.: *et cum spiritu tuo.* Deinde antiph. *Benedic, domine, domum istam.* Et aspergatur aqua benedicta cum odore incensi. Postea dicat orationes." (Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. vii. art. 4, ord. iii.)

[3] Printed by Martène (*u.s.*). *e.g.* ord. iv, v, vi.

[4] "Quibus dictis, ingrediantur omnes clerici ad infirmum conjunctique in unum decantantes septem psalmos poenitentiae. His expletis, sequitur oratio."

"His expletis, benedicatur aqua; ac inde aspergatur super infirmum vel in domo a sacerdote." (Martène, *u.s.* ord. xi.)

[5] "Cum autem venerit sacerdos ante ostium faciat signum crucis et sic ingrediatur." (Martène, *u.s.* ord. xii.)

the invalid lies. "When a sick person is to be anointed," so runs the rubric, "let a priest celebrate a mass for him. And then, when all are come together, let the priest come in person with a portion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which the deacon shall carry, while before him there go two subdeacons with candlesticks and lighted tapers therein, the cross, holy water, and censer. When he comes to the door of the house where the sick man lies, the priest shall sprinkle holy water, and begin this antiphon, *O Lord, arise*, and the psalm, *O God, we have heard with our ears*, with the *gloria*. After these shall be recited the chapter, *Show us*."[1] In this *ordo* occurs the Mozarabic hymn, *Christe caelestis medicina Patris*,[2] which is here sung as a preliminary to communion.

In this last example we become conscious of a change. Up to a certain date, say the end of the tenth century, the ceremonial—the cross borne before the procession, the use of holy water, and the censing—all seems to be directed more or less consciously against the demons of disease and the enemy of souls.[3] The lights, as natural symbols, appear to be part of the regular ceremonial of a procession for any purpose. We pass over to the next century, and find that the centre of gravity, so to say, has shifted. The processional lights and the censing have another significance —they are employed in honour of the Eucharist. This is, perhaps, rather strongly stated. It is more true to say that the ceremonies have acquired an added meaning; and the change was not, perhaps, so sudden as it might appear. Yet it is at least symptomatic of the period that in this pontifical of Narbonne we first meet with definite mention of the sacrament in the ceremonial directions.

From this point onward the ceremonial adjuncts that we

[1] "Dum autem unguendus est infirmus, celebret pro eo missam sacerdos. Deinde convenientibus omnibus veniat et ipse cum portione corporis et sanguinis domini, quam portet levita, praecedentibus illum duobus subdiaconibus cum candelabris et super accensis cereis et cruce et benedicta aqua et thuribulo. Accedente autem sacerdote ad ostium domus ubi infirmus jacet, spargendo benedictam aquam, incipiat hanc orationem: *exurge domine*. Psal. *Deus auribus*, cum *gloria*," etc. (Martène, *u.s.* ord. xiii.)

[2] *P.L.* lxxxvi. 972, 973. Blume, *Analecta Hymn.* xxvii. no. 208. cf. Férotin, *Liber Ordin.* 377.

[3] Atchley, *op. cit.* pp. 131 ff.

have described grow more and more exclusively honorific. "The Body of the Lord," says a canon of a provincial Synod of Rouen (1198), "is not to be carried forth by day or night except it be accompanied by a light, the cross, and holy water;"[1] and this is the tone of all regulations on the subject after the Berengarian disputes. We need not pursue the matter further in this place, for in an appendix we shall have opportunity to consider it at greater length.[2]

We must take note of the fact that, as the parochial system settled itself, it became necessary to prescribe how the "*parochus*" should carry the *viaticum* to sick members of his flock. The sacramentaries originally contemplated stately processions of capitular clerks and ordered rites and ceremonies accordingly;[3] but toward the end of the period with which this work is concerned it is usual to find provincial and diocesan synods declaring in what manner the individual parish priest shall take the sacrament abroad. In other words, the minimum observance of the directions in the sacramentaries had to be stated.

The Council of York (1195) orders the parish priest to carry the Eucharist himself to the sick, and to be clad in such clerical habit as is suitable to the dignity of the sacrament. A light is to be borne before it, unless by reason of bad weather or difficulties of the way, this is impossible.[4] Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, and papal legate, who presided at this council, issued a similar injunction five years later in a synod of the southern province.[5] The injunctions promulged by Richard Marsh, Bishop of Durham (*c.* 1220), bid the priest have two pyxes, one of which is to remain always in the church, while the other is

[1] *Cap.* 3: "placuit etiam ne corpus dominicum sine luminare, cruce et aqua benedicta, sive de die, sive de nocte deferatur." (Hard. vi. 2. 1905.)

[2] See p. 256.

[3] Some of the later sacramentaries show traces of adaptation to parochial requirements.

[4] "*Can.* 1: ". . . quoties autem communio exhibenda est infirmis, sacerdos in propria persona hostiam in habitu clericali tanto sacramento convenienti deferat, lumine praecedente, nisi aeris intemperies vel viarum difficultas vel alia ratio praepediat." (Hard. vi. 2. 1930.)

[5] *Can.* 2: ". . . his adjicimus, ut reponatur eucharistia in pyxide munda et honesta, et in pyxide munda et honesta deferatur ad aegrum, linteo mundo superposito, et lucerna praecedente ac cruce, nisi aeger valde remotus fuerit." (Hard. vi. 2. 1958.)

to be used for conveying the Eucharist to those in need. The Eucharist itself is to be enclosed in a purse, and the pyx covered with a fair linen cloth.[1] Elsewhere the use of a purse alone without a pyx was known;[2] but this was generally forbidden, because the Host so reserved and borne about was apt to break up into fragments.[3]

We shall have occasion in another place to return to the ceremonies accompanying the progress of the sacrament from the church to the sick bed, and here will do no more than note the complete mediaeval ceremonial prescribed in the injunctions issued on this subject by St. Edmund of Canterbury (*c.* 1236).

The Host is to be laid in a clean and fair linen cloth inside the pyx, over which a linen covering is placed; lamp, bell, and cross are ordered. The priest is to wear a stole, and, unless the sick case lies at a great distance, a surplice as well. A vessel for the ablutions of the ministrant's fingers is a necessary part of the equipment; and the ablutions are consumed, if possible, by the invalid as a "*purificatio oris.*"[4]

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia* I. p. 581. (Quoted by Bridgett, *op. cit.* p. 171.)

[2] The Eucharist was reserved in a silk purse at Hill Deverel in the early years of the thirteenth century. (See p. 197.) The Irish clergy carried the sacrament in a "*perula*" (Gildas Cambr. *Top. Hib.* II. 19). (See p. 214.)

[3] *Constitutions of Abp. Peckham*, iii. 25: "dignissimum eucharistiae sacramentum praecipimus de caetero taliter custodiri ut videlicet in bursa vel loculo propter comminutionis periculum nullatenus collocetur, sed in pixide pulcherrima intrinsecus lino candidissimo adornata in qua ipsum corpus domini repositum in aliquo coopertículo de serico, purpura vel lino purissimo operiri praecipimus, ita quod sine comminutionis periculo possit inde faciliter extrahi et apponi." (Wilkins, *Concilia* ii. 48.)

[4] "Cum eucharistia ad aegrum fuerit deferenda, habeat sacerdos pixidem mundam et honestam, ita scilicet quod una semper in ecclesia remaneat, et in alia in qua sit eucharistia in bursa posita mundissima, in qua deferat corpus dominicum ad aegrotum, linteo mundo superposito et lucerna praecedente, nisi aeger valde remotus fuerit, et cruce similiter, si fieri potest, nisi crux fuerit ad alium aegrotum deportata. Praecedente quoque tintinnabulo, ad cujus sonitum concitetur devotio fidelium. Habeatque secum semper sacerdos horarium seu stolam quando cum eucharistia, sicut diximus, vadit ad aegrotum. Et si aeger non remotus fuerit, in superpellicio decenter ad eum vadat, habeatque vas argenteum sive stanneum ad hoc specialiter deputatum quod semper ad aegrotum deferat; ut in eo aegro dare valeat post sumptam eucharistiam suorum loturam digitorum." (Wilkins, *Concilia* i. 638.)

Nothing has yet been said in this chapter concerning monastic customs. They do not present any features strikingly different from those that were usual in contemporary secular surroundings.

A version of the *consuetudines* of Cluny, written in the first half of the eleventh century, provides a good example of the developed monastic rite. Unction, as was customary at this period, precedes the communion of the sick.[1] Notice is given that the rites for the sick are to be performed; the brethren assemble in choir; a priest vests in alb and stole. Four lay brothers assist: one takes the holy water, another the cross, a third the censer, and a fourth bears the holy oil. The abbot begins the *miserere*, and the procession moves toward the infirmary, holy water and cross going before, followed by the lay brothers, who bear respectively the censer and the oil. Then come the ministrant, the boys, and the abbat, behind whom the rest follow in pairs in order of seniority. The *peace be unto this house* is said, censing and sprinkling go forward, and after a prayer special psalms with their antiphons are recited by the assembled convent. Unction is administered, and then, leaving the rest of the brethren and the boys in the infirmary, the ministrant and the four lay brothers attendant go to fetch the Eucharist from its place of reservation in the church. In the meantime the proctor cleanses the sick man's mouth in readiness for the communion. The priest and his assistants return, singing suitable psalms (*Pss.* li, liv, lxvii, lxx). He bears the Host, two of the lay brothers carry lights, one still bears the censer, and the fourth a cruet of wine for the ablutions. All salute the sacrament by bowing, and the sick man is to raise himself, as well as he can, out of reverence to the Eucharist. After communicating him the priest washes his fingers in wine, the *kyrie* and the *paternoster* with other acts of devotion follow. The sick man kisses the cross and all those about him; and once more raising the *miserere*, the abbot and the rest return.[2]

[1] Originally communion seems commonly to have preceded unction; but the order was reversed before the eighth century. Toward the end of the fourteenth century unction had begun in most places to reoccupy its ancient position after communion. The reasons for these changes are discussed by Scudamore (*N.E.* pp. 1007 ff.).

[2] Albers, *Consuetudines Monasticae*, I. p. 191. (See p. 167 above.)

Udalric's version gives more detailed information as to the manner in which the sacrament is handled. It is approached with acts of reverence and censed. Then the ministrant breaks off a portion and, holding it in his fingers above a chalice, bears it to the infirmary. The chalice and his hands are covered with a fine linen veil, and all who meet the procession on the way do reverence to the Eucharist. The Host is administered steeped in wine.[1]

There was no need for a special pyx *ad deferendam hostiam* in the monastery, because the ministrant of *viaticum* had but a short distance to go. This custom of holding the Host in the fingers over the mouth of a chalice is therefore characteristically monastic.

DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATING THE RITE OF CLINICAL COMMUNION

A. An abstract of Ménard's text of the *ordo ad visitandum infirmum*, in the lost codex of St. Remi (A.D. 798–800) at p. 344.

Ordo ad visitandum infirmum.

Cum ingreditur sacerdos domum infirmi jacta aqua benedicta, primo dicendum ab introeuntibus, pax huic domui *ter*; *et aspergatur aqua benedicta cum odore thymiamatis, vel alterius incensi, dicendo Antiph.* Benedic, domine, domum istam. *Psalm*: Deus misereatur nostri. *Oratio*: Benedic, domine Deus omnipotens, locum istum ut sit habitantibus in eo sanitas et sanctitas, virtus et castitas, victoria et sanctimonia, etc. *Alia*: Exaudi nos, domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, sempiterne Deus, et mittere dignare angelum tuum sanctum de caelis, qui custodiat, foveat, etc. *Alia*: Adesto domine, supplicationibus nostris, et hanc domum serenis oculis tuae pietatis illustra, etc. *Alia*: Adesto, domine, supplicationibus nostris, et famulos tuos quos vocati charitatis visitamus officiis, etc. *Alia*: Praesta, domine, nobis famulis tuis per hanc creaturam sacrae aspersionis, etc. *Alia*: Exaudi nos, domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, ut si qua sunt adversa, etc. [*Alia*:] Exaudi nos, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, et humilitatis nostrae officiis gratiam tuae visitationis admisce, etc.

Orationes ad supervenientes infra domum dicendae: Deus humilium visitator, etc. Deus, qui nobis famulis tuis praesentiae tuae signa manifestas, etc. *Tum sacerdos ad infirmum dicat:* Vocasti, etc. . . . *Infirmus dicat*: Desideravi tecum loqui, ut mihi poenitentiam et remissionem peccatorum tradas. *Sacerdos dicat*: Det tibi dominus Jesus Christus veniam; tamen si Deus in te respexerit, custodies illam? *Infirmus respondet*: Custodio. *Deinde sacerdos audeat confessionem ejus, sicut melius inquirere poterit, aut scriptis, aut verbis. Tunc facit crucem ex cinere super pectus infirmi, et imponit cilicium super caput ejus. Post haec sequuntur poenitentiales psalmi septem, id est,*

[1] D'Achery, *Spicileg.* I. p. 700. (See p. 168 above.)

psalmi. Domine, ne in furore tuo. Beati quorum. Domine, ne in furore tuo, *duo.* Miserere mei, Deus. Domine, exaudi. De profundis. Domine, exaudi. *Oratio*: Parce, domine, parce famulo tuo ill. quem redemisti, Christe, sanguine tuo, ne in aeternum irascaris ei, qui venturus es judicare vivos et mortuos, et saeculum per ignem.

Incipit litania.

Kyrie eleison, *ter.*
Christe eleison, *ter.*
Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis.
Sancta et perpetua virgo, succurre in angustiis constituto.
Sancta Maria, Dei genitrix, ora pro famulo tuo.
Sancte Michael, ora pro illo.
Sancte Gabriel, ora pro illo.
Sancte Raphael, ora pro illo.
Omnes sancti archangeli, orate pro illo.
Omnes sancti patriarchae, orate.
Omnes sancti prophetae, orate.
Sancte Joannes, ora . . . [about eighty saints more are invoked].
Omnes sancti ab initio mundi usque ad praesens, orate pro nobis et pro hoc infirmo.
Propitius esto, parce nobis et isti, domine.
Propitius esto, libera eum, domine.
Ab omni malo, libera eum, domine.
Ab hoste malo, libera eum, domine.
Ab insidiis diaboli, libera eum, domine.
A cruciatu et morte perpetua, libera eum, domine.
Ab ira tremenda, libera eum, domine . . . [etc.].
Per annuntiationem tuam, libera eum, domine.
Per adventum tuum, libera eum, domine . . . [etc.].
Peccatores, te rogamus, audi nos.
Ut pacem perpetuam ei dones, te rogamus, audi nos.
Ut compunctionem cordis ei dones, te rogamus, audi nos . . . [etc.].
Fili Dei, te rogamus, audi nos.
Agne Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, parce nobis et isti, domine.
Agne Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis et isti, domine.
Agne Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, dimitte peccata ejus, domine.
Christe, audi nos, *ter.* Kyrie eleison, *ter.* Christe eleison, *ter.* Kyrie eleison, *ter.* Pater noster.

Preces.

Salvum fac servum tuum, Deus meus, sperantem in te.

Dominus conservet eum, et vivificet eum, et beatum faciat eum in terra . . . [etc.].

Exurge, domine, adjuva nos et eum, et libera nos et eum propter nomen tuum.

Tunc psalmum Inclina, domine, *totum.*

Oratio. Omnipotens et misericors Deus, quaesumus immensam pietatem tuam, ut ad introitum humilitatis nostrae hunc famulum tuum ill. in hoc tabernaculo fessum jacentem salutifere visitare digneris, etc.

Sequitur confessio infirmi. Domine, minister Christi domini nostri, comprehendi nullius valet solertia, quibus a diebus adolescentiae meae

vicibus exsecrabilia contraxi opera ; excedunt enim pluralitate sui numerorum fines, quia et comparatione meorum peccaminum nullus invenitur iniquus. Nullum quippe genus peccati inveniri potest, cui me non subdiderim, cujusque facibus et loris non sim circumdatus. Nunc quoque dies meae resolutionis instant, quibus hominem exire[1] compellor ; nunc ultimum vocationis meae diem ingemiscens expavesco, quia quae male carni consentiens perpetravi, digna ultione puniri pertimesco, et nisi Dei clementia tolerer[2] merito me jam pro meis sceleribus ultrix vindicta ulcisceretur. Idcirco fessis artubus, dissolutisque corporis vasibus, omnia[3] viscerum meorum valentia amissa, pietate tuae misericordiam singultu interposito implorare non cesso, quatenus potestate coelitus tibi collata vincula meorum piaculorum enodes, et precum tuarum studiis commissa mea pies, ut cum reprobis non ducar ad tartara, quin potius tuo interventu caelestia merear sublimari ad gaudia sempiterna.

Absolutio. Si principali sententia constat quia in multis offendimus omnes, unde ingemiscimus, ita principali sententia consolamur, quia si confiteamur peccata nostra, fidelis et justus est[4] . . . quin Jesus Christus conditor et redemptor, ac salvator noster, quem habemus advocatum justum apud Patrem, et est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris, et interpellat pro nobis fideliter confitentibus, et dimittit nobis peccata nostra, et emundat ab omni iniquitate. Quapropter, frater noster, confitenti tibi peccata tua, per ecclesiasticam apostolicae auctoritatis potestatem, quam dominus noster Jesus Christus tradidit discipulis et apostolis suis, dicens : *Accipite Spiritum sanctum, quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis ;* et per eosdem apostolos suos ipsorum successoribus, quorum vices licet indigni tenemus, etsi non merito, tamen nomine atque officii susceptione eamdem potestatem donavit, et in se credenti fideliter dixit : *Fiat tibi secundum fidem tuam* : gratia et potentia sua, virtute sancti Spiritus, qui est remissio omnium peccatorum, dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua, liberet te ab omni malo, conservet te in omni opere bono, et perducat te ad vitam aeternam, et ad sanctorum consortium supernorum civium. Amen.

Exhortatio sacerdotis ad circumstantes. Oremus dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, fratres carissimi, et cum omni supplicatione rogemus, ut hunc famulum suum illum per angelos sanctos suos visitare laetificare et confortare dignetur, qui vivit et regnat.

Sequitur ant. Succurre, domine, infirmo huic et medica eum spirituali medicamine, ut in pristina sanitate a te restitutus gratiarum tibi sanus referat actionem. *Psal* : Ad dominum cum tribularer. *Orationes* : Deus, qui famulo tuo Ezechiae, etc. *Alia* : Omnipotens mitissime Deus [etc.] . . . *Alia* : Dimitte, domine, peccata nostra, et tribue nobis misericordiam tuam, etc.

His ita factis, roget sacerdos confessor infirmi alios sacerdotes ut dicant orationes quae sunt de reconciliatione poenitentis ad mortem.

[Here follow prayers and psalms with antiphons.]

Kyrie eleison, Pater noster et preces. Utquid, Domine, recessisti longe ? . . . [etc.].

Tunc symbolum palam dicitur, hoc est credo in Deum Patrem, *usque* vitam

[1] (?) exuere. [2] *leg.* tolerarer. [3] *leg.* omnique. [4] a lacuna.

aeternam. *Deinde a sacerdote dicatur ad infirmum* : Credis, frater, quod diximus symbolum ? *Cum responderit, aut nutu significaverit,* credo, *unguatur a sacerdote, vel plurimis sacerdotibus de oleo sanctificato.* . . . [etc.].

[THE UNCTION.]

. . . *Sequitur reconciliatio ante communionem ipsa die* : Deus misericors, Deus clemens, qui indulgentiam tuam nulla temporum lege concludis sed pulsanti misericordiae tuae januam aperis, poenitentes etiam sub ipso vitae hujus termino non repellis, respice propitius super famulum tuum *ill.* remissionem sibi omnium peccatorum tota cordis confessione poscentem. Renova in eo, piissime Pater, quod actione, quod verbo, quod ipsa denique cogitatione, diabolica fraude vitiatum est, et unitati corporis ecclesiae membrum redemptionis annecte. Miserere gemituum, miserere lacrymarum, et non habentem fiduciam, nisi in tua misericordia, ad sacramentum tuae reconciliationis admitte, quia nullius animae in hoc corpore constitutae difficilis apud te aut tarda curatio est. Fidelis enim es in verbis tuis, qui conversum peccatorem non [ad] longa temporum spatia differendum, sed mox ut ingemuerit dixisti esse salvatum. Per . . . *Alia* : Majestatem tuam, domine. *Alia* : Majestatem tuam quaesumus.

Tunc auferatur cilicium quod super caput infirmi positum fuerat ; et dicatur : *Ant* : Heu me ! quia incolatus meus prolongatus est. *Psalm* : Ad dominum cum tribularer. *Ant* : Unde veniet auxilium mihi. *Psalm* : Levavi oculos meos. *Ant* : In domum domini laetantes ibimus. *Psalm* : Laetatus sum. *Ant* : Qui habitas in caelo, miserere nobis. *Psalm* : Ad te levavi oculos. *Ant* : Benefac, domine, bonis et rectis corde. *Psalm* : Qui confidunt. *Tunc sacerdos dicat* : Propitietur dominus cunctis iniquitatibus tuis (et sanet omnes languores tuos, redimatque de interitu vitam tuam, et satiet in bonis desiderium tuum qui solus in Trinitate unus Deus vivit et regnat per immortalia saecula saeculorum. Amen.)[1] *Communicet infirmum tunc dicens* : Corpus domini nostri Jesus Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam. Sanguis domini nostri Jesu Christi redimat te in vitam aeternam. Pax domini nostri Jesu Christi et sanctorum communio sit tecum et nobiscum in vitam aeternam. Amen. *Oratio in consummationem.* Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui subvenis in periculis et necessitatibus succurrentibus (majestatem tuam supplices exoramus ut mittere digneris sanctum angelum tuum qui famulum tuum *ill.* in angustiis et necessitatibus laborantem consolationibus tuis attollat, quibus et de praesenti consequatur auxilio, et aeterna remedia comprehendat. Per dominum nostrum.)[2]

Et septem dies vel multo plures si necessitas fuerit, tam de communione quam de alio officio erga infirmum fiat ; ut sicut apostolus dicit, immo per eum Spiritus sanctus ait : Si in peccatis fuerit, dimittentur ei. *Debent etiam ex ministris sanctae ecclesiae procurare in*[3] *canonici cursus circa eum decantentur, id est, matutinae, prima, tertia, sexta, nona, vesperum, completorium. Quod si episcopus adfuerit, benedictionem dabit ; si non, singuli sacerdotes singulas has orationes dicant* : Dominus Jesus Christus apud te sit, ut te defendat ;

[1] Text completed from "Cod. sancti Eligii," Ménard's text of "*Gregorianum.*"

[2] Text completed as before. [3] *leg.* ut.

intra te sit, ut te conservet ; ante te sit, ut te deducat : post te sit, ut te justificet ; super te sit, ut te benedicat, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto vivit regnat Deus.

Benedictio : Benedicat te Deus Pater, sanet te Dei Filius, illuminet te Spiritus sanctus, etc.

Alia : Benedicat te Deus Pater, adjuvet te Christus Filius Dei ; corpus tuum in suo servitio custodiri et conservari faciat, etc.

Alia : Benedicat te Deus Pater, qui in principio cuncta creavit ; benedicat te Deus Filius, qui de supernis sedibus pro nobis salvator descendit ; benedicat Deus Spiritus sanctus, qui in similitudine columbae in flumine Jordanis super Christum requievit, etc.

Omnipotens dominus in visitatione suae misericordiae tibi propitietur et ab infirmitate qua detineris relevando tui misereatur. Amen. Voluntatem tuam in suo beneplacito amplificare, et orationibus ac benefactis tuis[1] te sibimet reconciliando acceptare dignetur. Amen. Addat etiam ut omnium virtutum caelestium et reliquorum sanctorum intercessionibus inter omnes saeculares anxietates custodiaris, et eorum participio, absolutus carnali carcere, interponi merearis. Amen. Quod ipse praestare dignetur, qui propter liberationem hominum homo dignatus est fieri, Deus et dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto vivit et regnat per immortalia saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Alia : Benedicat te Deus Pater, custodiat te Jesus Christus, illuminet te Spiritus sanctus omnibus diebus vitae tuae. Amen. Confirmet te virtus Christi, indulgeat tibi dominus universa delicta tua. Amen. Beatae et gloriosae semperque virginis Dei genitricis Mariae, omniumque simul sanctorum, quaesumus, intercessio gloriosa te protegat, et ad vitam aeternam perducat. Amen.

B. The short alternative Rites from the same document. (p. 256.)

(i) After mass *pro infirmo. Item fiat reconciliatio.* Deus misericors (ut supra) *alia* : Majestatem tuam, et reliqua. *Tunc etiam symbolum, sicut ante praedictum est, et communio corporis.*

(ii) *Item abbreviatio. Cum vero ingravari coeperit, ad succurrendum, facta aqua benedicta, dicatur oratio haec* : Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, qui es via, veritas, et vita, exaudi nos, et conserva famulum tuum *ill.* hunc, quem vivificasti et redemisti pretio et magno munere sanguinis Filii tui, qui tecum vivit et regnat. *Tunc unguatur oleo* : Unguo te de oleo sanctificato, ut salveris aeternaliter in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. Amen.

Collecta : Concede, domine, nobis famulis tuis, ut orantes cum fiducia dicere mereamur : Pater noster, libera nos ab omni malo, custodi nos semper in bono, qui regnas in saecula saeculorum.

Communicet dicens : Corpus et sanguis domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam. Amen.

Post haec dicendum est : Agamus Deo nostro omnipotenti gratias, quod terrenae nos originis atque naturae sacramenti sui dono in caelestem vivificaverit demorationem, qui cum Filio et Spiritu sancto vivit et regnat.

[1] *leg.* orationes et benefacta tua.

C. The Rite contained in the *Stowe Missal* (MS. D. II. 3, in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin) (from Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. xxxii, p. 33).

[*fol.* 60 R] Oremus fratres dominum nostrum pro fratre nostro [quem duri] ad pressens malum langoris adulcerat [*fol.* 60 V] ut eum domini pietas caelestibus dignetur curare medicinis qui dedit animam det et salutem : per.

Deum vivum omnipotentem cui omnia opera restaurare confirmare facillimum est fratres carissimi pro fratre nostro infirmo N. supliciter oremus quo creatura manum sentiat creatoris ut aut in reparando aut in recipiendo in nomine suo pius pater opus suum recreare dignetur : per dominum nostrum jhesum christum.

Domine sancte pater universitatis auctor omnipotens aeterne deus cui cuncta vivunt qui vivificas mortuos [*fol.* 61 R] et vocas ea quae non sunt tanquam ea quae sunt tuum solitum opus qui es magnus artifex pie exercere in hoc tuo plasmate : per christum.

Deus in cujus manu tam alitus viventes quam vita morientis, fratres dilectissimi deprecemur ut corporis hujus infirmitatem sanet, et animae salutem prestet ut quod per merita non meretur missericoridiae gratiae consequatur o[illegible]ntibus nobis prestet : per dominum nostrum jhesum christum.

Domine sancte pater omnipotentens aeterne deus qui es via et veritas et vita exaudi et conserva famulum tuum hunc N. quem vivificasti et redemisti [*fol.* 61 V] pretio magno sancti sanguinis filii tui qui regnas :

Deus qui non vis mortem sed ut convertatur peccatoris[1] et vivat, huic ad te ex corde converso peccatá dimite et perennis vitae tribue gratiam : per dominum.

Deus qui facturam tuam pio semper donaris affectu inclina aurem tuam supplicantibus nobis tibi ad famulum tuum N. adversitate valitudinem corporis laborantem placidus respice vissita eum in salutari tuo et caelestis gratiae concede medicamentum : per.

[Here follow two short lections, St. Matt. xxii. 23, 29–33, and xxiv. 29–31 ; then the *Unction*, which, except for a few verbal differences, is identical with that given in B (*above*).]

Oramus te domine pro fratre nostro N. cui infirmitate sua officium commonionis ut si qua eum saecularis macula invassit aut vitium mondialem ficit dono tuae pietatis indulgeas et extergas : per.

[*fol.* 63 V] Domine sancte pater te fideliter deprecemur ut accipiendi fratre nostro sacrosanctam hanc eucharistian corporis et sanguinis domini nostri jhesu christi tam carnis quam animae sit salus : per dominum :

Exaudi nos domine jhesu christe deus noster pro fratre nostro infirmo te rogantes ut tua sancta eucharistia sit ei tutella : per dominum.

Pax et caritas domini nostri jhesu christi et commonicatio sanctorum tuorum sit semper nobiscum. r. amen.

Corpus et sanguis domini nostri jhesu christi filii dei vivi altisimi *rl.*[2]

[1] *peccatoris* should follow *mortem* immediately.

[2] We may supply, *sanitas sit tibi in vitam perpetua et salutem* (Bk. of Deer, Warren, *Lit. and Rit. of Celtic Church*, p. 164) ; or, *sanitas sit tibi in vitam eternam* (Bk. of Moling, *ibid.* p. 173) ; or most probably, *servat animam tuam in vitam perpetuam* (Bk. of Dimma, *ibid.* p. 170).

[*fol.* 64 R] Accepto salutari divini corporis cibo lalutari[1] nostro, jhesu christo gratias agimus quod sui corporis et sanguinis sacramento nos a morte liberavit et tam corporis quam animae homano generi remedium donare dignatus est qui regnat :

Agimus deo patri omnipotenti gratias quod terrenae nos originis atque naturae sacramenti sui dono in caelestem vivificaverit demotationem : per dominum :

Converte nos deus salutum nostrarum et infirmorum praesta salutem nostrorum.

[*fol.* 64 V] Quia satiavit animam inanem et animam essurientem satiavit. *bis,* alleluia alleluia. Vissita nos deus in salutari tuo, alleluia. Fortitudo mea *usque* salutem, alleluia. Calicem salutaris accipiam *usque* invocabo, alleluia. Refecti christi corpore et sanguine tibi semper domine dicamus alleluia. Laudate dominum omnes gentes *usque in finem.* Sacrificate sacrificium justitiae et sperate in domino.

Deus tibi gratias agimus per quem [*fol.* 65 R] misteria sancta celebravimus et ad te sanctitatis dona deposcimus qui regnas in saecula saeculorum.

Benedicat tibi dominus et custodiat te ostendatque dominus faciam suam tibi et misseriatur tui convertat dominus vultum suum ad te et det tibi pacem : *et respondit* amen. *Tunc signans eum dicito* : Signaculo crucis christi signaris. Pax tecum in vitam eternam : *et respondit* amen. *Finit ordo commonis.*

[1] *leg.* salutari.

CHAPTER XVII

SOME CUSTOMS OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES IN CONNECTION WITH THE RESERVED EUCHARIST

THE Eucharist is regularly reserved in the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and in some of the separated bodies. The two species are reserved, as they are administered, conjointly. Some Western writers contend that the Easterns do not communicate the sick *sub utraque specie*, for it is maintained that in drying the particles of an intincted Host the species of Wine is destroyed.[1] Whether or not the identity of the species is retained after it has ceased to be liquid is a point for theologians to dispute ; but that the intention is to communicate the sick in both kinds cannot seriously be questioned. Otherwise, the preparation of intincted Hosts would have no purpose. Moreover, in places where a daily celebration of the Liturgy is the rule, the sacrament is not desiccated for reservation, but is renewed in freshly-intincted form from day to day. Desiccation is necessary only if the conjoint elements are to be reserved for any length of time.

No good evidence, apparently, can be found for the use of intinction among the Greeks during the first nine or ten centuries. After this date they began freely to employ that type of intinction which we have called "sacramental" ; *i.e.* that in which both consecrated species are used.

We may also remark that just as it was at one time the custom in the West to moisten with unconsecrated liquid a portion of the reserved intincted Host in order to facilitate deglutition,[2] so the Orientals saturate the intincted fragments in a little wine or wine and water at clinical communion.

There does not appear to be any evidence for the use of "consecratory" intinction.

[1] Vacant-Mangenot, *op. cit.* s.v. Communion sous les deux espèces. III. 562.

[2] See chap. x.

A. THE GREEK CHURCH

The usual practice of the Greeks is to prepare on Maundy Thursday a store of the conjoint species to serve for reservation throughout the year. The manner in which the Eucharist is prepared for this purpose resembles that which is followed in providing for communion at the Liturgy of the Presanctified. For the latter, the following directions are given in the Euchologion.

"In the great and holy Forty Days, when the priest is to perform the Liturgy of the Presanctified, at the prothesis on the preceding Sunday he proceeds as usual, and after he has cut the first bread and pierced it, he cuts the other breads, saying over each of them: *In commemoration*, *As a sheep*, *Sacrificed*, and *One of the soldiers*. Then he pours water and wine into the holy chalice, saying the accustomed words, and covers them with the holy veil, and censes them, repeating the prayer of prothesis. And thus he begins the divine Liturgy and celebrates in the customary manner. But when he is about to sign the breads, he says: *Make this bread*, in the singular, for Christ is one; and not as some ignorantly say: *Make these breads*. And when he is about to elevate, he elevates them all together, and breaks the first Bread of the oblations and places the fragment in the holy chalice and pours in the warm water as usual. Then taking in his right hand the holy spoon he dips it into the holy Blood and with his left hand he takes each of the Breads and he brings forward the holy spoon that has been dipped in the holy Blood and applies it cross-wise to the holy Bread on that side whereon is imprinted the cross under the soft portion, and places it in the *artophorium*." [1]

[1] "Ἑρμηνεία τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας τῶν προηγιασμένων.

"τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ Τεσσαρακοστῇ, ὅτε μέλλει ὁ Ἱερεὺς ποιῆσαι Προηγιασμένην Λειτουργίαν ἐν τῇ Προσκομιδῇ τῆς Κυριακῆς ποιεῖ ὡς σύνηθες. καὶ μετὰ τὸ περικόψαι τὸν πρῶτον Ἄρτον καὶ κεντῆσαι, περικόπτει καὶ τοὺς ἑτέρους Ἄρτους λέγων εἰς ἕνα ἕκαστον τὸ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν· ὡς πρόβατον· θύεται· καὶ τὸ εἷς τῶν στρατιώτων. Εἶθ' οὕτως ἐγχέει ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ οἶνον καὶ ὕδωρ, λέγων τὰ συνήθη, καὶ συγκαλύπτει αὐτὰ μετὰ τῶν ἱερῶν καλυμμάτων, καὶ θυμιᾷ, λέγων τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς προθέσεως. καὶ οὕτως ἄρχεται τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας, καὶ ἐκπληροῖ αὐτήν, ὡς ἔθος. ὅτε δὲ μέλλει σφραγίσαι τοὺς Ἄρτους, λέγει· Ποίησον τὸν μὲν Ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἑνικῶς, ὡς εἷς ἐστιν ὁ χριστός· οὐχ' ὡς τινες ἀμαθῶς λέγουσι, τοὺς Ἄρτους τούτους· καὶ ὅτε μέλλει ὑψῶσαι ὑψοῖ ὅλους ὁμοῦ καὶ μερίζει τὸν προσκομιζόμενον πρῶτον Ἄρτον, καὶ τίθησι τὴν Μερίδα ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ποτηρίῳ καὶ ἐγχέει καὶ τὸ ζέον, ὡς ἔθος. Εἶτα λαβὼν τὴν ἁγίαν λαβίδα μετὰ τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρός, βάφει αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ Αἵματι· τῇ δὲ ἀριστερᾷ χειρὶ λαμβάνει ἕκαστον Ἄρτον καὶ εἰσφέρει τὴν ἁγίαν λαβίδα μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Αἵματος βεβαμμένην, καὶ ἐγγίζει αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἄρτῳ σταυροειδῶς ἐν τῷ μέρει ἐν ᾧ ἐχαράχθη ὁ σταυρὸς ὑπὸ τὴν ψίχα καὶ ἀποτίθησι τοῦτον ἐν τῷ ἀρτοφορίῳ. Εἶτα λαμβάνει καὶ τοὺς ἑτέρους, καὶ ποιεῖ ὡσαύτως εἰς ἕνα ἕκαστον καὶ συστέλλει αὐτοὺς πάντας ἐν τῷ ἀρτοφορίῳ."

The Russian service book contains almost identical instructions (Hapgood, "*Service Book*," p. 127.)

The conjoint sacrament reserved for the sick is subsequently broken up into fragments (commonly called *μαργαρῖται* or pearls) [1] and desiccated. The manner of performing these operations is given below in the account of the customs of the Orthodox Russian Church, concerning which more detailed information was accessible to the present writer.

The artophorium commonly stands on the holy table, and before it burns the "sleepless light." It stands in the middle of the farther side, and is made in various shapes. Sometimes it has the form of a little cupboard, sometimes it represents a miniature sarcophagus under a domed canopy, or the ark of the covenant with the cherubim stretching their wings above the receptacle of the Eucharist.[2]

Suicer describes the artophorium as "a vessel of wood, or rather, where possible, of silver or gold, fashioned like a pyx. This . . . the Greeks call *ἀρτοφόριον*, or at other times, *πυξίον*." [3]

Suspension of the pyx or artophorium is not unknown. It seems to have been a common practice in the neighbourhood of Constantinople in the seventeenth century. M. de Nointel, French Ambassador to the Sultan, made a tour of the churches round about with the purpose of learning what was the Greek faith and practice concerning the Eucharist. In some places he found the artophorium, in the form of a small box, suspended in a bag from a nail

[1] In allusion to St. Matt. vii. 6, often used in a eucharistic context. The term margarita was not unknown in the West.

[2] Dr. Brightman, in a letter to the writer.

[3] *Thesaurus*, s.v.

inside the ikonostasis.[1] It is said that the Western mode of suspension has also prevailed locally.

For communion of the sick the Eucharist is carried forth in a pyx, sometimes called πυξομῆλον in allusion to its spherical form.[2] At the bedside the sacrament is placed in a small chalice, and a little wine and warm water are added before administration.

Although they are more usually communicated at the Liturgy, infants newly-baptized sometimes receive the reserved sacrament. Goar appends the following remarks to the office of ablution, which takes place eight days after Baptism, and is immediately succeeded by the rite of cutting the hair.[3] "The Greeks," he says, "make use of a spoon, which they call the λαβίς, to remove from the chalice containing the conjoint species a drop which is then placed upon the infant's tongue. And if the initiation takes place when the Liturgy is not being celebrated, they produce for

[1] Printed in "*Perpetuité de la Foy*," vol. iii, pp. 424–448.

"Me trouvant il y a quelque temps dans l'Eglise de Calcédoine, où l'on prétend que le Concile a été tenu, je demandai à un Religieux qui me montroit ce qu'il y avoit de plus remarquable, où étoit le S. Sacrement : il me montra un sac de toile pendu à un clou, dans lequel il y avoit une boëte, où étoit enfermé ce précieux dépôt de notre salut ; et pour satisfaire ma curiosité il l'ouvrit et me fit voir les espêces et les apparences extérieures du pain." (pp. 429, 430.)

cf. Leo Allatius : "In hoc eodem sacrario [*i.e.* the 'Altar'] pretiosissimum Christi corpus pro infirmis non certo in loco, cum id ex arbitrio sacerdotum pendeat ; in muro tamen appenditur et non sine veneratione asservatur. Quandoque vero in ecclesiis pusillis misellisque neque lampade neque alio lumine colitur." (Cited by Martène, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. v. art. 3.)

[2] *ibid.* : "Demum cum opus fuerit sacerdos cum diaconorum comitatu et luminibus accensis, psalmos et alia pro re enuncians, involucrumque illud secum deferens in aegroti et jam moribundi aedes pergit per viam omnibus etiam Turcis, si obviam venerint, veneratione quadam obstupentibus. . . . Ubi ad aegrotum ventum est, exemptam cum cochleari e pyxomelo margaritam unam, vinoque ad hunc usum delato in aedem cochleari perfusam ut emollescat, post exactam confessionem peccatorum et supplicationes tum a sacerdote, tum ab infirmo recitatas, ille infirmo porrigit : cui postea bona deprecatur et cum eadem pompa unde egressi sunt convertuntur et margaritas reponunt." (*u.s.*)

[3] There is no rubric definitely requiring communion of infants in the offices of baptism, ablution, and cutting of the hair in the modern text of the Euchologion, but the eighth-century Barberini *Euchologion* orders the celebration of the Liturgy at the conclusion of the baptismal service. (Conybeare and Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum*, p. 406.)

the purpose the sacraments reserved for the sick ; but if during the celebration of the Liturgy the elements there consecrated are employed."[1] The latter, he remarks, is the method most approved.

B. THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

In the Russian Church the sacrament that is to be reserved for *viaticum* is prepared at the Liturgy of Maundy Thursday, or whenever else a fresh supply is needed. A second obley is taken at the prothesis and prepared in the same manner as those used for the Presanctified, and is laid, along with the obley that is to be used in the communion, on the *antimins* or corporal. It is not broken in the consecration ; but after the hallowing of the gifts the celebrant holds it over the chalice, and with the *lzbitza*, or spoon, intincts it with the species of Wine, taking care to avoid any superfluity. It is then placed in the *kivot* (= κιβώτιον), or pyx, where it remains until the end of the Liturgy. When the Liturgy is over, the intincted Host is removed from the *kivot* and dried in the following manner at the *Zhertvennik*, or table of prothesis. The *antimins* is spread and the Host laid upon a paten (*diskos*) and censed by the priest, who makes the customary acts of reverence. The Host is then broken up into small fragments with the *kopyo*, or spear. A clean stone or tile is placed over a brazier of hot charcoals, and the *diskos* is either laid upon or held above it ; and the drying of the sacred fragments is carefully performed. When dry the sacrament is laid in the ark or *kovtcheg*, which is another name for the *kivot*. This stands permanently upon the holy table. Where the *kovtcheg* is not of gold, or at least silver-gilt within, a piece of paper is inserted below the sacrament. This is the manner of preparing the reserved Eucharist in churches where there is no daily celebration, and at times of the year,

[1] *Euchology.* p. 375 : "Quod et factitant Graeci, nam cochleari, quod λαβίδα dicunt, facto sanguine intincto, guttulam e calice eductam pueri lingua exsugendam apponunt : et si quidem extra Liturgiam aliquem initiant, aegrotis sacramenta reservata depromunt ; sin Liturgia celebratur, ex ipsis speciebus consecratis ; prout Pachymetes et Maximimus in cap. 2. Dionysii *de Eccl. Hierarch.* scribunt : νῦν δὲ ἀκριβέστερον γίνεται ἐν τῇ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων τελείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῖς νεοφωτίστοις δεῖ μεταλαμβάνειν."

i.e. Lent, when only certain days of the week are liturgically observed. Where and when the Liturgy is celebrated daily, the drying of the Host (which is intended to preserve it from the risk of corruption) is omitted, and the sacrament is renewed every day.

The reserved Eucharist is kept inside the standing *kovtcheg* upon the holy table, and when reserved for long periods it is reverently inspected from time to time, lest any accident should occur. The priest is forbidden to keep it in his own house.[1] It has several forms. Sometimes it is spoken of as the "grave,"[2] because, like the tomb or grotto in Joseph's garden, it contains the Body of the Lord. Anciently it was commonly made in the form of a temple or church, and called by the name of "Zion" or "Jerusalem." Many of these "Zions," some elaborately fashioned, are preserved at Moscow and at Novgorod. At solemn celebrations, when a bishop officiated, they were carried forth at the Lesser Entrance; at other times they were borne at the Greater Entrance along with the rest of the vessels used in the Liturgy. They still remain in use in some monastic churches. The *kovtcheg* or *kivot* of modern make is usually of simpler form, but whatever its shape, it must be provided with a cover and must bear a cross. Gold, silver, and, more rarely, other metals, are the material of which the *kivot* is made.[3]

The equivalent of the pyx *ad deferendam eucharistiam* is called the *daronositza*, *i.e.* the bearer of the gifts. It is generally made with two compartments, one for the sacrament, the other for the spoon (*lzhitza*), and a small chalice. In some forms a third division is provided for the ablutions-sponge or *gubka*.[4] It is wrapped in a covering and enclosed in a purse of silk, and borne to the sick by the priest in a napkin folded pouchwise and tied about his neck. On coming into the invalid's presence the priest confesses him, if this has not been previously done, and then communicates him thus. A particle of the sacrament is placed in a chalice

[1] K. Nikolsky, *Ustav Bogosluzhenia* (Petrograd, 1907), pp. 693 f.

[2] cf. the sarcophagus shape of the artophorium mentioned above, and the phrase "corporis Christi novum sepulchrum" in the benediction of a chrismal in *Missale Francorum* (p. 219), and also St. German's remarks on the *turris* (p. 217).

[3] Nikolsky, *op. cit.* p. 10.

[4] *ibid.* p. 693.

and a little wine is added, "as much as may be sufficient for the sick person to receive it," and the sacrament is conveyed to his mouth by means of the spoon. Suitable prayers are provided for the occasion.[1]

C. THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

Whenever there is need to prepare the sacrament for reservation a portion of the conjoint Eucharist is set aside at the Liturgy and desiccated afterwards. The vessel of reservation, which is generally made of silver or gold, is termed the *serpadoop*, or receptacle of the holy gifts. It is kept in a movable cupboard that stands on the right-hand side of the holy table. The supply of the reserved Eucharist is commonly renewed at least every Sunday, in accordance with the ancient rule of St. Sahak.[2] It is used not only for clinical communion, but also for the communion of infants after baptism and of others who require it. The Eucharist is borne to the sick in the *serpadoop*.[3]

An ancient Armenian *Euchologion*[4] which dates from the tenth century at the latest provides an office for the communion of the sick. "The priest takes the saving mystery, and the cross and the censer precede him, and they go to the sick man," the priest repeating the whole of psalm cxix. and other devotions as he goes. At the bedside an unusual type of confession is made, or rather the fact that the invalid has made confession is certified by a layman; prayers and psalms are recited, and three lections are read. After the creed and the *Our Father*, the priest says "the *Christ is offered as a sacrifice*, and the *O taste*. And he shall give the saving mystery and say the prayer, We thank Thee, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hast made Thy servant worthy of these heavenly gifts, to partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc.[5] The Eucharist was at this date intincted for reservation.

A modern text follows the ancient order, and expands it somewhat where the directions are summarized in the

[1] Shann, *Book of Needs* (a translation of the *Trebnik*), pp. 123 f.

[2] See p. 182.

[3] From information communicated by the Rev. Nersès G. Sevadjian.

[4] Conybeare and Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum.* [5] *ibid.* pp. 114, 116.

earlier version. The priest is instructed to deliver "the saving holy mystery to the sick man with caution," repeating two verses from the psalter. "And as the sick man tastes it in his mouth, they give glory and say, We have been filled with Thy blessings, O Lord, tasting Thy Body and Blood," etc.[1]

D. THE EAST SYRIAN OR NESTORIAN CHURCH

In this isolated part of Christendom there are in vogue peculiar customs in connection with the obley-loaf, by which means is secured a continuity in the substance of the obleys used, as they pretend, from apostolic times.[2] But whether the sacrament itself was ever officially reserved is not certainly known.[3] No trace of the custom now survives,[4] and the only possible reference to the reserved Eucharist appears to be contained in the following passage: "Order of the signing of the chalice or of the *geza*; that is, when the *geza* remains during the night in which the holy thing is baked.—Ordered by Mar Israel, the quick-witted Bishop of Kashkar. First, it is not fitting that the *geza* should be left during the night except from necessity. But when it happens that it has been left during the night,

[1] *ibid.* p. 118.

[2] They reserve a piece of the dough every time that the obley is prepared in order to mix it with the next baking. They have moreover the "holy leaven," which is augmented and renewed from year to year on Maundy Thursday. This looks like a faint memory of yearly renewal of the reserved sacrament. No Eucharist may be celebrated without the "holy leaven," and so its use is in a manner parallel to the *Fermentum* and *Sancta* of the Western Church. (See Woolley, *The Bread of the Eucharist*, pp. 58 ff.)

[3] It may have died out in consequence of the constant raids of the Moslems from the days of Tamerlane onward.

[4] Badger, *Nestorians and their Rituals*, makes no reference to reservation; Fortescue, who relies on such authors as Assemani, in *The Lesser Eastern Churches* (p. 156), says, "Nestorians do not now reserve the Holy Eucharist at all"; Maclean and Brown, *The Catholicos of the East* (p. 261), assert that reservation is no longer practised, and conclude that its disappearance is in consequence of Moslem persecution.

The Rev. F. N. Heazell, commenting, in a letter to the writer, on the passage quoted in the text, says that he has found reservation practised nowhere among the Eastern Syrians. He has travelled and lived among the most conservative and obscure tribes, and become acquainted with their pecial dialects without meeting with any memory of the custom at all.

let there be in it nothing prepared at all except *bûkhrê* or true *prîsâthâ*. But let not the chalice be left at all during the night, although the light before it be not taken away. And in the morning the priest and deacon enter and prepare the altar in the usual manner, and bring out the pyx containing the *qudsha*, and arrange the *bûkhrâ* on the paten, and place it on the altar and cover it with a veil, saying," etc.[1]

Of the terms used in this passage, *qudsha* is the holy thing, and is often used of the sacrament; *bûkhrâ*, pl. *bûkhrê*, is the obley or eucharistic loaf, and *prîsâthâ* has the same meaning. The Rev. F. N. Heazell, who provided this translation and the substance of the notes appended, believes that the text may be corrupt.[2]

[1] *Cambridge University Library, MS.* no. 1988 (date 1528). Mr. Heazell's translation is approved by Dr. Maclean, Lord Bishop of Moray. Neither of these authorities believe that reservation is intended.

[2] "The sense of the passage turns upon the meaning of the word *geza*: it is commonly used of the Host, though it can hardly bear that sense here. 'Let there be in it nothing prepared at all except *bûkhrê*,' *i.e.* eucharistic loaves, cannot refer to the ingredients of the Host. Probably *geza* here means not the Host, but the vessel in which it is placed. Such a meaning would be quite unusual, and no such use of the word is to be found in Payne Smith. *Bûkhrâ* and *geza* are probably used to describe the same thing, viz. the eucharistic loaf.

"By giving the ordinary meaning to *geza*, *i.e.* the Host, the passage is rendered entirely obscure. It is clear that the chalice is not to be left over night, but the light which burns before it, supposing it to be left over night, points to the fact that the consecrated elements were in the mind of the writer, though it by no means follows that if *geza* means the Host [*i.e.* the obley], the sense is that the consecrated Host is intended. The passage may mean that Mar Israel is giving directions for baking the bread just before the service, which is the present custom, and permits in certain circumstances the use of bread prepared at an earlier stage; but the wine, *i.e.* mixed wine, was not to be prepared beforehand. It is highly probable that the text is corrupt, and if so no meaning can be deduced from the passage. I know of no other copy of this document."

APPENDIX

Some Notes on the Origins of the Extra-liturgical Cultus of the Eucharist

IN chapter viii allusion was made to a passage in St. Gregory Nazianzen, and it was there remarked that this place, along with certain statements in Optatus, had often been used in controversy as evidence for the early origin of a *cultus* of the reserved sacrament. The passages in Optatus were discussed, and were found to furnish no support for the contention that the African Church of his day was accustomed to keep the Eucharist at or upon the altar. The expressions used by him plainly relate to the presence of Christ associated with the actual performance of the Liturgy.[1]

The passage in St. Gregory occurs in the funeral sermon preached by him on the occasion of his sister Gorgonia's death (*c.* A.D. 380), and it may be rendered as follows: "She despaired of all others, and betook herself to the Physician of all. And at an untimely hour of the night, when there was a slight intermission of her sickness, she fell before the altar in faith, and calling aloud on Him Who is honoured at it (*or*, thereon), and making all kind of entreaty, bringing to His remembrance all the acts of power that He had ever wrought (for she was acquainted both with those of old time and those of later days), she was bold at last to do a thing pious and yet magnificently daring. She followed the example of her who stanched her flow of blood by the skirts of Christ. And what was it that she did? Laying her head upon the altar, with such another loud cry and that with tears as rich as hers who drenched Christ's feet of old, and threatening that she would not let go before she received health, she anointed her whole person with this medicine which proceeded from herself; and whatsoever of the species (antitypes) of the precious Body or Blood her hand treasured (or had treasured), mingled

[1] *De schism. Donatist.* vi. 1. (*P.L.* xi. 1066.) (See p. 107).

this with her tears. And, O wonder! she went away feeling that she was healed. . . ."[1]

What is to be made of this? Some would understand it to mean that Gorgonia went up to an altar in a church and took from some receptacle thereon the consecrated elements. If this were the true sense of the passage, we should have here a very clear instance, not only for official reservation in a public building, but also for a sort of exposition of the Eucharist at a very early date. But such an interpretation rests upon the supposition that the phrase "she fell before the altar in faith, calling aloud upon Him Who is honoured at it (or, thereon)," implies that she was following a recognized custom in coming to worship the Presence constantly secured at the altar by the reservation of the sacrament. For the existence of such a custom we have no other evidence whatever. As Father Thurston remarks in his edition of Bridgett, "In all the Christian literature of the first thousand years no one has apparently found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the Body of Christ, which was kept on the altar."[2] He makes an attempt in another place[3] to get at the meaning of this difficult passage, and rejecting the interpretation given above, together with that which represents Gorgonia as bringing in her hand the Eucharist privately reserved,

[1] "πάντων ἀπογνοῦσα τῶν ἄλλων, ἐπὶ τὸν πάντων ἰατρὸν καταφεύγει, καὶ νυκτὸς ἀωρίαν τηρήσασα, μικρὸν ἐνδούσης αὐτῇ τῆς νόσου, τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσπίπτει μετὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ τιμώμενον ἀνακαλουμένη μεγάλῃ τῇ βοῇ, καὶ πάσαις ταῖς κλήσεσι, καὶ πασῶν αὐτὸν τῶν πώποτε δυνάμεων ὑπομνήσασα, σοφὴ γὰρ ἐκείνη καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ νέα, τέλος εὐσεβῆ τινὰ καὶ καλὴν ἀναισχυντίαν ἀναισχυντεῖ. μιμεῖται τὴν τοῖς κρασπέδοις χριστοῦ ξηράνασαν πηγὴν αἵματος. καὶ τί ποιεῖ; τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἑαυτῆς προσθεῖσα μετὰ τῆς ἴσης βοῆς, καὶ δάκρυσι τοῦτο πλουσίοις ὥσπέρ τις πάλαι τοὺς πόδας χριστοῦ καταβρέχουσα, καὶ μὴ πρότερον ἀνήσειν ἢ τῆς ὑγιείας τυχεῖν ἀπειλοῦσα, εἶτα τῷ παρ' ἑαυτῆς φαρμάκῳ τούτῳ τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἐπαλείφουσα, καὶ εἴ πού τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν, τοῦτο καταμιγνῦσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν· ὢ τοῦ θαύματος· ἀπῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἰσθομένη τῆς σωτηρίας, κούφη καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ διάνοιαν, μισθὸν ἐλπίδος λαβοῦσα τὸ ἐλπιζόμενον, καὶ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς εὐρωστίᾳ κομισαμένη τὴν τοῦ σώματος." (*Gregorii Theologi Opera*, ed. Bened. p. 229.)

[2] *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, p. 170, footnote.

[3] *J.T.S.* xi. 42. (January, 1910.) (pp. 275–279). This study was occasioned by a criticism, made in the *Church Quarterly Review* of October, 1909, of the statement quoted in the text.

suggests one which avoids certain difficulties but not without importing others. His careful attention to grammatical points in the text [1] that have been overlooked by other commentators, leads him to propose this as the most probable solution. Namely, that Gorgonia went unobserved to the church and flung herself down before the altar in prayer, and on a sudden inspiration "put forth out her hand in the hope of finding some few crumbs or traces of the sacred species. . . ." "Moved by the spirit of the woman with the issue of blood, she clings to the altar, and tells [the Lord] that she will not let go until she be made well. She bedews her body not only with this already-mentioned remedy that she had," but with the "remedy which came from herself . . . *i.e.* her tears—tears of faith like those of the woman who was a sinner—mingling with these tears whatever crumbs or traces of the species of the sacred Body *or* Blood her (moist) hand had enriched itself with."[2]

As for the possibility of fragments and stains of the elements lying about the altar, while it is true that the fashions of reverence change from age to age, yet writers such as Tertullian, Origen, and Cyril of Jerusalem are careful to inculcate into the minds of their disciples great carefulness for the sacred gifts.[3]

Whatever the real sense of the passage may be, this much at least is clear—that the incident provides no argument either for open reservation on altars in the fourth century, or for any adoration of the Eucharist thus reserved.

It is, as we should naturally expect, in the latter part of the eleventh century that the rudiments of a cultus defiintely paid to the reserved Eucharist first appear.

[1] *e.g.* the use of the aorist ἐθησαύρισεν; which appears "to imply a momentary act of appropriation"; the conjunction ἤ instead of καὶ—"Body *or* Blood."

Father Thurston suggests that Gorgonia may have been a catechumen at this time, and in that case surmises that she would be prohibited from touching or even seeing the Eucharist in the ordinary course of things. Catechumens (*e.g.* Satyrus) did occasionally, in abnormal circumstances, come into possession of the sacrament.

[2] *loc. cit.* p. 278.

[3] Tertullian, *de Corona* 3; Origen, *in Exod. Homil.* xi. 7, xiii. 3; Cyril, *Catech. Mystag.* v. 20–22.

And their appearance is rather sudden; it takes place, apparently, in Normandy, as a demonstration against Berengarian views of the sacrament.

No version of the *Customs* of Bec that is extant goes behind a manuscript written between the years 1290–1310;[1] yet, although the indebtedness of Lanfranc's *Statuta* drawn up for use at Canterbury to early customs of Bec has been over-estimated, it is reasonable to suppose that he was following an innovation, lately introduced, at that stronghold of orthodoxy, when he provided for the solemn bearing of the Host in the Palm Sunday procession. His directions are much fuller than those which are given in the only customs of Bec that are known; and this seems to argue the priority of the latter.

The chief point of interest lies here: the Eucharist has replaced the gospel-book which had previously been the central object in the procession, and its progress elicits acts of adoration.[2]

"When they are come to the place, a station is made by the whole congregation. The cantor begins the antiphon, *occurrunt turbae*, and two priests vested in albs come forth, who are to carry the shrine (*feretrum*), which should have been brought thither by the same priests a little before dawn. In this the Body of Christ ought to have been enclosed. Toward this shrine those who bear the banners

[1] A. A. Porée, *Hist. de l'Abbaye du Bec*, I, p. 476.

[2] The older Roman *Ordines* (*e.g.* that given by Hittorp, *op. cit.* 46 ff.) describe a simple procession with palms and branches and flowers.

Then comes the stage of development that is shown by Ps.-Alcuin (*De Eccl. Officiis*). The gospel-book is borne in pomp, enclosed in a kind of shrine.

"Hodie preparatur quoddam portatorium honestissime in quo intromittitur sanctum evangelium quod intelligitur Christus et statuitur in ecclesia ante aram unde clerus processurus est." Then follows the *benedictio palmarum.* "His finitis, dantur a custodibus palmae, accipienteque populo ramos arborum olivarum sive florum, inchoatur antiphona, *pueri Hebraeorum.* Deinde suscipiunt diaconi supra scriptum portatorium cum evangelio, baiulantes cum ingenti exultatione iugum Christi suave et onus eius leve, praecedente aqua benedicta cum candelabris atque thymiamateriis cum aliis ornamentis. Insuper etiam laicorum schola cum vexillis atque fanonibus a longe praeeunte." (Hittorp, *op. cit.* 246.)

The third stage is reached, as is remarked in the text above, when the Eucharist replaces the *evangelium.* The remark that the gospel-book represents Christ shows how the transition from book to Host came about.

and crosses and all the things that have been named above are to move forward immediately. And, while those who carry the shrine stand still, these others shall stand right and left of the shrine in the order in which they have come. . . . When the antiphon, *occurrunt turbae*, is finished, the boys and those who are with them begin the antiphon, *hosanna filio David*, bowing the knee both at the beginning and at the end of the antiphon, because *hosanna* is said in both places. The choir shall repeat this antiphon, and bow the knee in like manner. . . . When this has been done, the abbot or the cantor begins the antiphon, *ave, rex noster*, and the bearers of the shrine pass through the middle of the station, the banner-bearers and the rest carrying the afore-mentioned things going in front, keeping the order as they return that was observed in coming. As the bearers of the shrine pass along, all shall bow the knee; not all at once, but one by one, on either side, as the shrine goes by." [1]

[1] "*Decreta pro ordine S. Bened.*" iv. "Cum autem perventum fuerit ad ipsum locum, fiat statio a toto conventu. Cantore autem incipiente antiphonam *occurrunt turbae* exeant duo sacerdotes albis induti, qui portent feretrum, quod parum ante diem ab eisdem sacerdotibus illuc debet esse delatum, in quo et corpus Christi esse debet reconditum. Ad quod feretrum praecedant statim qui vexilla portant et cruces et caetera quae superius dicta sunt. Et stantibus iis qui feretrum portant, stabunt et ipsi a dextera et a sinistra ipsius feretri, ordinati sicut venerunt. Pueri vero accedentes stabunt versis vultibus ad ipsos reliquos cum magistris suis et quibusdam cantoribus qui auxilio eis esse possunt. Maiores vero versi erunt ad invicem eo modo quo in choro stare solent. Sic autem ordinetur haec statio ut modicum intervallum sit inter pueros et majorem conventum. Finita antiphona *occurrunt turbae*, incipiant pueri et qui cum eis sunt antiphonam *hosanna filio David* flectentes genua et in principio et in fine antiphonae, quia in utroque *hosanna* dicitur. Quam antiphonam chorus repetat et similiter genua flectat. Deinde a pueris cantetur antiphona *cum angelis*, in fine tantum antiphonae genua flectentibus. Quae antiphona a conventu repetatur et similiter venia accipiatur. Taliter his peractis, abbate vel cantore incipiente antiphonam, *ave, rex noster*, transeant portitores feretri per medium stationis, praecedentibus his qui vexilla portant, et caeteris superius dictis portitoribus, servato ab omnibus ordine in redeundo quem habuerunt in eundo. Quibus transeuntibus flectent genua, non simul omnes, sed singuli huic et inde, sicut feretrum transibit ante eos. Percantata hac antiphona, cantent et alia si spatium loci plura poposcerit. Cum venerint ad portas civitatis stationem faciant, separatis ab invicem, prout locus patietur, utrisque lateribus, feretrum vero ante introitum portarum sic ponatur super mensam pallio coopertam ut praedicti portitores, ex utroque latere stantes, habeant ad feretrum in medio eorum positum versas facies suas. Locus vero super introitum portarum honeste debet esse paratus et cortinis et dorsalibus.

"Taliter ordinata statione, canant pueri de loco apto et qui praecepto cantoris qui cum eis erunt, *Gloria laus*, etc. . . .

"His dictis inchoet cantor responsorium *ingrediente domino*; et ingrediente civitatem processione, duo majora signa pulsentur, donec caetera signa, processione intrante in chorum, pulsentur ad missam. Sic ordinata processio veniens usque ante portas monasterii, faciat stationem, servantibus pueris ordinem suum inter utrumque chorum. Deponatur iterum feretrum super mensam pallio coopertam," etc. (*P.L.* cl. 456, 457.)

The rites described in the *Customs* of Bec (from MSS. of date 1290–1310, but representing earlier traditions) are as follows: "Ipso die secretarius summo mane debet feretrum mittere per fratres cum lumine ad locum ubi processio debet ire, in quo debet honeste reponi corpus domini cum reliquiis.

"Cum autem ad locum stationis pervenerint, stent fratres per ordinem sicut solent in choro; pueri vero versi ad feretrum genua flectentes dicant, antiphonam, *hosanna filio David*, qua dicta flectant pueri tantum genua, quam repetant omnes similiter flectentes genua. Item pueri flectant genua et dicant antiphonam *dignus es domine* totam; qua finita, ut primum flectant genua. Cum autem inchoaverit cantor antiphonam, *ave rex noster*, transibunt latores feretri per medium chori, et ipsis transeuntibus flectant omnes genua, sequentesque feretrum cantent antiphonas." (Mart. *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* III. xii. 15.)

On Maundy Thursday, too, special veneration is paid to the sacrament. "After mass, vespers are to be said . . ., and in the meantime the priest, preceded by the procession, comes to the altar, and goes to a place appointed and suitably prepared, and there lays the Body of the Lord, censing the place both before and after the deposition. And a light shall burn constantly before this place." [1] Also on Good Friday, after the adoration of the cross, "the priest resumes his chasuble and stole [that had been laid aside for the preceding ceremony], and accompanied by the deacon, also in his stole, with lay-brothers bearing lights and censer, they come to the place where, on Maundy Thursday, the Body of the Lord had been laid. He places incense in the thurible and censes the sacrament, and gives it to the deacon to carry back again. . . . When they approach the altar, all the rest of the brethren adore the Body of the Lord,

[1] "*Decreta*": "expleta missa fiat oratio vespertina supra formas. Interea sacerdos, praecedente processione cum ad altare venit, vadat ad locum constitutum decentissime praeparatum, ibique reponat corpus domini, incensato ipso loco et ante repositionem et post repositionem Ante quem locum lumen continue ardeat." (*P.L.* cl. 460.)

bowing the knee."[1] After further censing of the sacrament, follows the mass of the Presanctified, at which all the brethren communicate.

Rather more than a hundred years later the canons issued by a synod of Paris under Bishop Odo contain directions for the better securing of reverence toward the Eucharist; and enjoin that the people shall be reminded that whenever they see the sacrament borne abroad they must bow as to their Lord and Maker, with hands joined in adoration until it be gone by. Borne to the sick, the Body of the Lord shall be carried in an ivory pyx, securely fastened; and a lantern is to go before, while the seven penitential psalms are sung with such others as the distance of the way requires.[2] Other injunctions issued by diocesan and other authority from time to time, concerning the ceremonial to be observed in bearing abroad the *viaticum*, lay stress upon the veneration that is to be paid to the Eucharist as it passes. Giraldus Cambrensis (*c.* 1205), for example, says that unless the weather prevent it, the priest must wear a decent surplice when he goes on this errand. The Eucharist is to be borne in a handsome pyx, over which the ends of the stole are to be folded cross-wise. The deacon is to go ahead with the light, even in the daytime, and the people are to venerate the sacrament, covering their eyes with their hands.[1]

Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, issued the following injunctions, characteristic of the time (1238), concerning the custody and use of the reserved sacrament. "The Eucharist, which is the sacrament of the Lord's Body, should always be kept with honour in a place set apart, clean and sealed (*i.e.* locked), and there be devoutly and faithfully reserved. And every priest shall often instruct his people that when in the celebration of mass the saving victim is raised on high, they must reverently bow, and that they are to do the same when the priest carries the Eucharist to a sick person. When he does this he must wear suitable habit, and cover the pyx with a fair veil; and as he goes and as he comes again he shall carry it openly and with honour before his breast with reverence and dread. A light shall always precede him, for [that which he bears] is 'the brightness of the everlasting light,'[2] by which means faith and devotion may be increased among all, as it is written in the General Council. A bell also shall always be borne with the light before the venerable Host of Christ's Body, that by the sound thereof the devotion of the faithful may be kindled to render the adoration due to so great a sacrament. Let priests take great care also lest the sacred Eucharist by some fault, or through over long keeping, become damp or mouldy, and so become disagreeable to behold or unpleasant to taste. And priests shall always be most ready and

[1] *ibid.*: "his ita gestis sacerdos resumpta casula cum stola et diaconus stola, praecedentibus conversis cum candelabris et thuribulo, vadant ad locum ubi quinta feria corpus domini fuit repositum; et posito incenso in thuribulo incenset illud, et sic tradat diacono ad reportandum. In eundo et redeundo conversos sequatur diaconus, sacerdos extremus veniat. Cum appropinquant altari, adorent omnes fratres corpus domini flexis genibus; collocato super altare Christi corpore, facta in calice vini et aquae commistione . . . incenset sacerdos corpus Christi et calicem," etc. (*P.L.* cl. 465.)

[2] A number of canons in this series deal with the veneration of the sacrament.

Odonis Ep. Paris. Synod. Constit.:

Cap. 5. 1. "Summa reverentia et honor maximus sacris altaribus exhibeatur et maxime ubi sacrosanctum corpus domini reservatur et missa celebratur."

5. 5. "Non permittant presbyteri diacones (comminatur episcopus eis qui hoc non servant) deferre infirmis sacrosanctum corpus domini, nisi necessitate, cum sacerdos absens fuerit: sed semper sacerdos cum magna reverentia et maturitate deferat in pyxide eburnea, bene clausa propter casum, et cum lucerna praecedente cantantes septem psalmos poenitentiales cum litania pro infirmo eundo et redeundo. Si longa via fuerit, addant quindecim psalmos et alias orationes," etc.

c. 5. 6. "Frequenter moneantur laici ut ubicumque viderint deferri corpus domini statim genua flectant tamquam domino et creatori suo et junctis manibus quoadusque transierit orent."

5. 7. "In pulchriori parte altaris cum summa diligentia et honestate sub clave sacrosanctum corpus domini custodiatur."

(Hard. vi. 2. 1939 ff.)

[1] (*Gemma Ecclesiast.* I. 6): "Eucharistia vero cum infirmis defertur cum honore debito et reverentia deferri debet et tractari, presbytero, scilicet si tempus et aura permiserint, in superpellicio honeste, ut decet, eunte; et eucharistiam in pixide pulchra, stola desuper in crucem complexa, populo adorandam et digne venerandam, prae oculis palmam portante, diacono quoque cum lucerna bajula etiam clara die praeambulante." (*R.S.* xxi. 2, p. 20.)

[2] An allusion to *Wisd.* vii. 26 (Vulg.).

prepared to visit the sick, not only by day but by night as well, whenever they are required; lest through any neglect of theirs a sick person should die without confession and communion of the Lord's Body and extreme unction, which God forbid."[1]

Numerous similar injunctions are to be found at this period, and behind them all lies the decree of the Lateran in 1215.[2] Yet it is to be noted that while an increase in external expressions of reverence is in full growth, and that through the elevation of the Host the way lies open for future developments, it is still the sacrament *in action* (so to say) that elicits the manifestation of devotion.[3] There is yet no trace to be found of any custom in which the presence of Christ is secured in the church out of mass-time for purposes of devotion.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

It is now possible to set down in order some of the more important conclusions to which the review of our subject seems to have led. To a large extent these have already been stated in the process of examining the evidence collected under the several heads, and only need to be repeated here in more concise form.

[1] *Ep.* 52: ". . . Eucharistia autem, quae sacramentum est dominici corporis, in loco singulari mundo et signato semper honorifice collocata, devote ac fideliter conservetur. Sacerdos vero quilibet frequenter doceat plebem suam, ut cum in celebratione missarum elevatur hostia salutaris se reverenter inclinet: idem faciens cum eam portet presbyter ad infirmum, quam in decenti habitu, supposto mundo velamine ferat et referat manifeste ac honorifice ante pectus cum reverentia et timore, semper lumine praecedente, cum sit candor lucis aeternae; ut ex hoc apud omnes fides et devotio augeatur; quemadmodum in generali concilio scribitur: tintinnabulum quoque simul cum lumine venerandam corporis Christi hostiam semper praecedat, ut ejus sonitu excitetur fidelium devotio ad tanti sacramenti debitam adorationem. Observent etiam sacerdotes cum omni diligentia ne sacra eucharistia per vitium aut diutinam conservationem contraheret humiditatem seu mucorem, unde reddatur vel turpis aspectu vel gustui abominabilis. Sacerdotes autem promptissimi sint et paratissimi, non solum diebus sed et noctibus ut aegrotantes, cum requiruntur, visitent: ne eorum negligentia, quod absit, moriatur infirmus sine confessione aut dominici corporis communione aut unctione extrema." (*R.S.* xxv. p. 155.)

[2] cf. for example, the instructions issued (1220) to the Diocese of Durham by Bishop Richard Marsh. (Wilkins, *op. cit.* I. 581.)

[3] Practically the attitude is that of the orthodox Easterns to-day.

1. First, we must recall the fact that from the earliest times *viaticum* was regarded as indispensible wherever it could be obtained.

2. We have seen good cause to believe that from at least the second century Christians were accustomed to receive the Eucharist at home when, by reason of infirmity or other sufficient cause, they were unable to communicate at the Liturgy.

3. So far as direct evidence goes, the earliest method of providing for the needs of such cases was by distribution of the Eucharist from the regular Liturgy.

4. This practice was generally superseded by the habit of private reservation by the laity; the change being brought about by the character of the later persecutions. Private reservation survived among the religious and the clergy after it had been forbidden to the laity.

5. Celebrations in the sick chamber were probably always exceptional. As soon as the Church began to own and to use public buildings for its services the custom of celebrating in private houses and chapels was restricted and carefully controlled.

6. All other methods of providing for the necessities of the sick were ultimately superseded by constant official reservation, and this arose as a natural modification (due to change of circumstances) of the private kind.

7. It is certain that the Eucharist was commonly reserved in private only under the single species of Bread; and if we are right in supposing that official reservation represents the restriction of the private habit, there is every reason to suppose that originally the Eucharist was reserved officially in the same form. This contention is borne out by the scanty evidence that we have been able to collect on the subject.

8. During the early Middle Ages there was in some areas a pronounced tendency to insist upon the use of both species conjointly for sick communion.

9. Eucharistic doctrine subsequent to the tenth century led to an undesigned return, on theoretical grounds, to the primitive practice of reservation under the sole kind of Bread.

10. Apart from the merely temporary expedient associated in early times with the Presanctified and with the

communion of the newly-baptized at solemn seasons, there is no evidence for the existence of any regular practice of reserving the species of Wine.

11. In case of necessity layfolk may act as ministers of the reserved Eucharist.

12. The original purpose of official reservation was purely practical. The development of any *cultus* of the reserved Eucharist was the direct outcome of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation as the orthodox belief.

FINIS

LIST OF PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES

AA.SS. See *Acta*.
Achelis, H.—*Die Canones Hippolyti.* (Texte und Untersuchungen, vi. Leipzig, 1891.)
Acta Sanctorum (Bollandist) (ed. J. Carnandet). Paris and Rome, 1863.
Albaspinaeus, G. A.—*De Veteribus Ecclesiae Ritibus.* Helmstadt, 1672.
Albers, Bruno—*Consuetudines Monasticae*, vols. i–v. Stuttgart, etc., 1900–12.
Amphilochii opera. Paris, 1644.
Anon, v. *La Perpetuité de la Foy.*
Atchley, E. G. C. F.—*Ordo Romanus Primus* (in Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers, vol. vi). London, 1905.
Besse, J. M.—*Les Moines d'Orient.* Paris, 1900.
Boll. v. *Acta.*
Bona, J. (Cardinal) — *Rerum Liturgicarum libri duo* (ed. R. Sala), 4 vols. Turin, 1747–53.
Bridgett, T. E.—*A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain* (ed. H. Thurston, S.J.). London, 1908.
Bright, W.—*Canons of the first four General Councils.* Oxford, 1892.
Brightman, F. E.—*Liturgies Eastern and Western.* Vol. i, *Eastern Liturgies.* Oxford, 1896.
Bruns, *Canones.*
Cabrol-Leclercq—*Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie.* Paris (in progress).
Cabrol-Leclercq—*Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica.* Paris (in progress).
Capitularia Ragum Francorum. Edit. A. Boret, in *M. G. H.*
Cavalieri, J. M.—*Opera Omnia Liturgica.* 1778.
Chardon, C.—*Storia de' Sacramenti* (Ital. transl.). Verona, 1754.
Conybeare, F. C., and Maclean, A. J.—*Rituale Armenorum.* Oxford, 1905.
Cossart, v. Harduin.
D. C. A.—See Smith and Cheetham.
D'Achery—*Spicilegium*, 3 vols. (edited by Mabillon, with additional vol., *Vetera Analecta*). Paris, 1723.
Dale, A. W. W.—*The Synod of Elvira.* London, 1882.
Delisle—*Mémoires sur d'anciens Sacramentaires.* Paris, 1896.
de Moléon—*Voyages liturgiques de France.* Paris, 1718.
de Vert, Claude—*Explication . . . des Cérémonies de l'Eglise.* Paris, 1709.
Dict. d'Archéol.—See Cabrol-Leclercq.
Dict. de Théol. Cath.—See Vacant-Mangenot.
Ducange—*Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (ed. Leopold Favre), 10 vols. 1883.
Duchesne, L.—*Christian Worship; its Origin and Evolution.* English tr. by M. L. McClure (3rd edition) from 4th French edition. London, 1910.
Duchesne, L.—*Liber Pontificalis.* Paris, 1886-92.
Duranti, J. S.—*De Ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae.* Rome, 1691.
Εὐχολόγιον, τὸ μέγα. Venice, 1839.
Feltoe, C. L.—*Sacramentarium Leonianum.* Cambridge, 1896.
Férotin, M.—*Liber Ordinum.* Paris, 1912.
Fortescuè, A.—*The Mass, a Study of the Roman Liturgy* (in Westminster Library). London, 1912.
Franz, A.—*Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter.* Freiburg im Breisgau, 1902.
Gerbert, M.—*Vetus Liturgia Alemannica.* St. Blaise, 1776.
Gerbert, M.—*Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae.* St. Blaise, 1777.
Goar, J.—Εὐχολόγιον, *sive Rituale Graecorum.* Paris, 1647.

Gore, C.—*Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation.* London, 1895.
Grancolas, J.—*L'Antiquité des Cérémonies qui se practiquent dans l'administration des Sacremens.* Paris, 1692.
Grancolas, J.—*Les anciennes Liturgies.* Paris, 1697-1704.
Guignard, Ph.—*Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne.* Dijon, 1878.
Haddan, A. W., and Stubbs, W.—*Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, 4 vols. Oxford, 1869-73.
Hapgood, Isabel—*Service Book of the Holy Orthodox Church.* Boston, 1906.
Hardouin, J., S.J.—*Conciliorum Collectio.* Paris, 1715.
Hart, G. W., and Frere, W. H. v. Rock.
Hauler, E.—*Didascaliae apostolorum fragmenta veronensia latina.* Leipzig, 1900.
Hartel, W.—*Cypriani Opera Omnia* (vol. iii, pt. i, in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiast. Latinorum.*) Vienna, 1868.
Hefele-Leclercq—*Histoire des Conciles (nouvelle Traduction française faite sur la deuxième édition allemande . . . par un religieux Bénédictin).* (In progress.)
H. B. S. See following entry.
Henry Bradshaw Society—*The Stowe Missal.* 2 vols. (ed. G. F. Warner). London, 1906, 1915.
Hinschius, P.—*Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae.* Leipzig, 1863.
Hittorp, M.—*De divinis Catholicae Ecclesiae officiis et mysteriis* (t. x. in *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, 4th edition, M. de la Bigne). Paris, 1624.
Iter Germanicum.
Krusch, B.—*Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum aevi Merovingici* (vols. iii and iv in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*). Hanover and Leipzic, 1896-1902.
Krusch, B. and Levison, W.—*id.* (vol. v in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*), 1910; (vol. vi of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*), 1913.
le Brun, P.—*Explication littérale, historique et dogmatique des Prières et des Cérémonies de la Messe*, 4 vols. Paris, 1726.
La Perpetuité de la Foy de l'Eglise catholique touchant l'Eucharistie, 5 vols. Paris, 1704.
Mabillon, J.—*Collectio Veterum Scriptorum*, v. *D'Achery.*
Mabillon, J.—*De Liturgia Gallicana.* Paris, 1685.
Mabillon, J.—*Praefationes in Acta Sanctorum ordinis Benedicti.* Venice, 1740.
Mabillon, J. and Germain, M.—*Musaeum Italicum*, 2 vols. Paris, 1687.
Macri, D. and C.—*Hierolexicon, S. Sacrum Dictionarium.* Rome, 1677.
Magistretti, M.—*Manuale Ambrosianum* (in *Monumenta Veteris Liturg. Ambrosianae*). Milan, 1905.
Mai, A.—*Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, 10 vols. Rome, 1825-38.
Martène, E.—*de Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus; de antiquis Monachorum Ritibus*, 4 vols. Venice, 1783.
Martène and Durand.—*Voyage littéraire de deux Religieux Bénédictins.* Paris, 1717.
Martène and Durand.—*Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, 5 vols. Paris, 1717.
Martigny, J. A.—*Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes.* Paris, 1865.
Maskell, W.—*Monumenta Ritualia.*
Ménard, H.—*Divi Gregorii Papae . . . liber Sacramentorum.* Paris, 1642.
Migne, J. P.—*Patrologiae Graecae Cursus Completus*, 165 vols. Paris, 1857-86.
Migne, J. A.—*Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus*, 221 vols. Paris, 1844-64.
N. E.—See Scudamore.
Neale, J. M.—*A History of the Holy Eastern Church.* Pt. i, General Introduction. 2 vols. London, 1850.
Neale, J. M. and Forbes, G. H.—*The Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church.* Burntisland, 1855.
К. Никольскій Пособіе Къ изученію Устава Богослуженія Православной Церкви. 7th ed. Petrograd, 1907.
O. R. P.—See Atchley.
Plummer, C.—*Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. Oxford, 1896.
Plummer, C.—*Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*, 2 vols. Oxford, 1910.
Potthast, A.—*Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des Europäischen Mittelalter.* Berlin, 1896.
Probst, F.—*Sakramente u. Sakramentalien in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten.* Tübigen, 1872.
P. G., *P. L.*—See Migne.

R. S.—Rolls Series.
Renaudot, E.—*Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, 2 vols. Frankfort-a-M., 1847.
Rock, D.—*The Church of our Fathers* (ed. G. W. Hart and W. H. Frere), 4 vols. London, 1903.
Ruinart, Th.—*Acta primorum Martyrum Sincera.* Ratisbon, 1859.
Sala, R. v. Bona.
St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, Transactions of, vols. iii and iv. London, 1895 and 1900.
Scudamore, W. E.—*Notitia Eucharistica.* London, 1876.
Smend, J.—*Kelchspendung u. Kelchversagung in der abendländishen Kirche.* Göttingen, 1898.
Smith and Cheetham—*Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 2 vols. London, 1875-80.
Stone, Darwell—*History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 2 vols. London, 1909.
Suicer, J. C.—*Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, 1728.
Surius, L.—*Historiae seu Vitae Sanctorum*, 13 vols. Turin, 1875.
Thiers, J. B.—*Traité de l'Exposition du St. Sacrement de l'Autel.* Paris, 1677.
Thiers, J. B.—*Traité des Superstitions qui regardent les Sacrements*, 4 vols. Avignon, 1777.
Thorpe, B.—*Ancient Laws and Institutes of England.* London, 1840.
Thurston, H. v. Bridgett.
Vacant-Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.* Paris (in progress).
Warren, F. E.—*The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church.* Oxford, 1881.
Warren, F. E.—*The Leofric Missal.* Oxford, 1883.
Wasserschleben, F. G. A.—*Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis libri duo de Synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis.* Leipzic, 1840.
Wilkins, D.—*Concilia Magnae Brittaniae et Hiberniae.* London, 1737.
Wilson, H. A.—*The Gelasian Sacramentary.* Oxford, 1894.

INDEX

Abbo of Fleury, *Collectio canon. ad Hugon.*, 154.
Abraham de Winton, 196.
acolyte, 19, 79, 205, 226.
Adalbert of Prague, St., 64.
Adelard, biographer of St. Dunstan, 27.
Ado, Martyrology of St., 19.
Ælfgifu or Æthelgifu, Queen, 22.
Ælfric, Canons of, 31, 177, 185, 224.
Æthelwolf, *Carmen de abb. Lindisf.*, 189, 215.
Agapetus, Pope, 118.
Albers, *Consuetudines monasticae*, 239.
Albertus Magnus, 153, 157.
Albigenses, 163.
Aldhelm, St., 207.
Alexander III, Pope, 65.
Alexander III, Pope, *Epist. ad Upsellen. archiep.*, 181.
Alexander of Hales, 157.
Alexander of Neckham, 214.
Allatius, 54, 81.
" *De missa praesanct.*, 90, 148.
altar, as place of reservation, 193 to 195.
Amalarius of Metz, *De eccl. offic.*, 79, 92, 100, 151.
Amalarius of Metz, *De divinis offic.*, 89.
Ambrose, St., *De excessu fratris*, 39.
" *De off. min.*, 223.
" *Epist.*, 107, 108, 202.
" oratory of, 100.
" *Vita*, 25, 26, 63.
Amiens, Manual of, 179.
Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *H.E.*, 114.
Angers, *ordo* of, 92.
Ansbert of Rouen, St., 128.
Ansegisus of Fontanelle, 134.
Anselm, St., 152, 156, 161.
Anskarii, Vita S., 177, 178.
Apollo or Apollonius of Hermopolis, St., 52.
Apophthegmata Patrum, 20, 26, 53, 146.
Apostolic Constitutions, 25, 73, 94.
Apostolic Constitutions, Liturgy of the, 142, 188.
Aquarians, 46.
Arbeo or Aribeo, 141.
arca, arcula, ark, 38, 46, 192, 201, 202, 249, 251.
Arcudius, 54.
Aridii, Test. S., 217.
Arles, diocese of, 125.
armarium, 212.
Armenian Church, 148, 179, 253, 254.
artophorium, ἀρτοφόριον, 194, 202, 248, 249, 252.
Athanasius, St., 62.
" Canons of, 113, 220.
Augustine, St., 202.
" *Confess.*, 72.
Augustine, St., *Contra Crescon. Donat.*, 201.
Augustine, St., *Contra duas epist. Pelag.*, 6, 176.
Augustine, St., *Contra Julian.*, 6, 39, 176.
Augustine, St., *De civitate dei.*, 25.
" *De peccat. mer.*, 6.
Augustine, St., *De remiss. peccat.*, 72, 73.
Augustine, St., *Epist.*, 81, 177.
" *Serm.*, 6, 176.
aumbry, 190–2, 194, 195, 197, 216.
ἀντίδωρα, 71, 73.

Balsamon, 81, 99, 227.
baptismal mass, 17.
baptistery, 198, 199, 209, 210.
Barlaam and Joasaph, St., 25.
Basil, St., 46, 83, 210.
„ *De Spirit. Sanct.*, 6.
„ *Epist.*, 5, 40, 41, 53.
„ *Regul. brev. tract.*, 29.
Basil, St., *Vita*, by pseudo-Amphilochius, 101, 210.
Bec, 32, 214.
„ *Customs of*, 259, 261.
Bede, 100.
„ *Hist. abbat.*, 128.
„ *Hist. eccl.*, 21, 127–9.
„ penitential of, 58, 228.
Benedict Biscop, 128.
Benedict, St., 99, 114.
„ *Rule of*, 175.
Benigni Divionen., Caerimoniale S., 150.
Berengar, Berengarian Controversy, 152, 164, 237, 259.
Bernard of Clairvaux, St., 159.
Bernard of Clairvaux, St., *Epist.*, 151.
Bernard of Clairvaux, St., *Adv. Catharos serm.*, 163.
Bernard the Penitent, St., 166.
Bernold of Constance (*Micrologus*).
De eccles. observat., 142, 162.
Besançon, 12th cent. *ordo* of, 92.
Betharii ep. Carnoten., Vita, 128.
Binterim, His theory about *eulogiae*, 71.
Birini, Vita S., 64.
Bobbio, 211.
„ MS., 172.
„ Sacramentary of, 126.
Bonifacii, Statuta S., 30, 64, 102.
Bourges cathedral, An ancient *turris*, belonging to, 218.
Brendani, Vita prima S., 57.
Burchard, 136, 234.

Cædmon, 127.
Caesarius of Arles, St., *Serm.*, 113, 114, 119, 128.
Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialog. monachorum*, 46, 99.
calamus, 137.
Callixtus, cemetery of, 204.
canistrum, 203, 204.
Canons of uncertain date (7th cent. or later), 95.
Canterbury Cathedral, 213.
Capitula ecclesiastica of Aix-le-Chapelle, 134.
Capitulare Evangeliorum, 76.
Capitularia Reg. Franc., 134.
capsa, capsis, capsula, 77, 193, 194, 204, 205, 217.
Carthusians, 185.
Carthusians, *Cartusiens. stat. antiq.*, 225.
Carolus Veranus, 47.
Cassian, *Instit.*, 52.
Celestine, Pope, 9.
Celtic *ordines*, 138, 139.
Celtic use of reserved sacrament, 56–8, 64.
Chad, St., 128.
chalice, *calix*, 18, 45, 81, 89, 95, 119, 122, 123, 130, 134, 137, 138, 145, 147–51, 153–7, 159–62, 164, 169–72, 175, 179, 181, 202–5, 209, 213, 215, 217–9, 222–4, 227, 240, 248, 250–2, 254, 255, 262.
chalice, baptismal, 199.
Charlemagne, 120, 131, 141.
„ *Capitulare*, 30.
Charles V, Emperor, 65.
Chezal-Benoît, 225.
children, Unconsumed remains of blessed sacrament given to, 96, 97, 189.
Chronicon Paschale, 84.
chrismal, *chrismale*, etc., 56–58, 126, 201, 206, 207, 218, 219, 252.
Chrysostom, St. John, 48, 199.
Chrysostom, St. John, *Ep. ad Innocent. pap.*, 83, 108, 180.
Chrysostom, St. John, *Homil. ad populum Antioch*, 209.
Chrysostom, St. John, *Hom. in Ephes.*, 81.
ciborium, κιβώριον, 207, 208, 211.
ciboire, 216.
cista, 204.

Cistercian *Consuetudines*, 171, 172, 187.
Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagog.*, 4.
Clement of Alexandria, *Stromat.*, 5, 35, 46.
Clement of Rome, Pope, St., *Epistle to the Corinthians*, 4.
Clement VII, Pope, 65, 208.
Cluny, 167–70, 201.
Cluny, *Antiquiores Consuetudines* of, 131, 147, 156, 167–9, 194, 201, 239.
Cluny, *statuta* of, 145, 170.
Cluniac missal, 151.
columba, περιστερά (see also "dove"), 115, 196, 199, 209–11, 216.
Columban, St., 211.
Columban, St., Rule of, 183, 184, 206.
Comgalli, Vita S., 56, 57, 206.
commixture, 79, 84, 137, 138, 157.
concomitance, v; 145, 152, 153, 155, 161, 164, 165, 176, 178.
conditorium, 189, 212.
Congregation of rites, 92.
consecratio e contactu hostiae, 138, 149, 151, 165, 172.
Constantine, 209, 216.
cophinus, 194, 212.
Coptic constitutions, 96.
Corbie, 137.
Corbinianus, Life of St., 140.
Cornelius, Pope, *Ep. ad Fabium*, 142.
corporate reservation, 55.
Cosenza (in Calabria), 192.
Councils and Synods:—
Aix-la-Chapelle (*c.* 812), 134.
Ancyra (314), 9, 221.
Angers (1273), 225.
Arles (314), 221, 223.
Armenian (4th cent.), 48.
Auxerre (578), 102, 137.
Braga (572), 71.
„ (675), 124, 137, 146.
„ (713), 154.
Bayeux (*c.* 1300), 97.
Councils and Synods:—
Carthage (390), 29.
„ (397), 102.
„ (398), 125.
„ (525), 102.
Clermont (1095), 162.
„ (1268), 97.
Constance (1415), 153.
Constantinople (536), 209.
Durham (1220), 164, 175, 237, 264.
Elvira (300), 6, 9, 13, 223.
Exeter (1287), 191.
Gangra (4th cent.), 29.
Hippo (393), 101.
Lanciano (890), 228.
„ (990), 185.
Laodicea (4th cent.), 29, 71, 81, 222.
Lateran (1215), 105, 157, 187, 190, 191, 264.
Le Mans (*c.* 1300), 97.
Leptinense (743 ?), 9, 125, 145, 177.
Liège (1287), 216.
Mâcon (585), 96, 97, 115, 121, 189.
Metz (888), 31, 143.
Nicaea (325), 7, 9, 117, 222, 223.
Orange (441), 7, 124, 151, 204.
Orleans (541), 154.
Paris (1198), 186, 190, 224, 225.
Pavia (9th cent.), 141.
Reims (9th cent.), 228, 234.
Rouen or Reims (7th cent.), 227.
Rouen (1072), 185.
„ (1198), 237.
„ (1231), 225.
St. Nîmes (1284), 225.
Saragossa (*c.* 380), 47.
Seville (1512), 189, 190.
Toledo (400), 9, 48, 81, 122.
„ (675), 122–4, 177.
„ (693), 95, 121.
Tours (567), 194.
„ (9th cent.), 185.
„ 136.
Trent (16th cent.); v; 153.
"in Trullo" (692), 81, 99, 226, 227.

Councils and Synods :—
Valentia (374), 9.
Verona (958), 194.
Westminster (1138), 186, 224, 228.
Westminster (1175), 161.
" (1200), 186, 225.
York (1195), 186, 225, 237.
Coxano (in Catalania), 140.
Cranmer Archbishop, 198, 211.
cultus (of reserved sacrament), 107, 256-64.
cuppa, cupa, coppa, 191, 196, 198, 212-4.
Cuthbert, St., 100.
" Metrical Life of, 27.
" *Vita S. Cudbercti*, 128.
cyphus, 212, 213.
Cyprian, St., 44.
" *De lapsis*, 6, 38, 176, 201, 222.
Cyprian, St., *Epist.*, 8, 12, 13, 24, 46, 81, 176, 222.
Cyril of Alexandria, St., *Advers. anthropomorph*, 29, 112.
Cyril of Alexandria, St., In Luc, 72.
" " In Joan, 72.
Cyril of Jerusalem, St., *Catech. mystag.*, 258.
Cyril of Jerusalem, St., *Hom. catech.*, 5, 142.
Cyril of Jerusalem, St., *Hom. in bapt.*, 6.

Daily communion, 40, 52, 80-82, 90.
Damasus I, Pope, 19.
daronositza, 252.
De baptismo (once attributed to St. Basil), 29.
De gest. episc. Antid., 213.
De l'Aubespine, 8.
De mensura poenitentiae, 183, 206.
De Rossi, *Inscript. Christ*, 204.
De sacramentis (attributed to St. Ambrose), 142.
De spectaculis (once attributed to St. Cyprian), 38.
deacon, Reserved sacrament carried by, 17, 21, 23, 34, 78, 86, 88, 94, 148, 187, 217, 220-5, 261.
deaconess, 20, 222, 226.
" *Decreta*" of pseudo-Isidore, 94.
Decreta pro ordine S. Bened., 260-2.
Deer, Book of, 139, 174, 245.
Didier of Cahors, *Vita*, 218.
Dimma, Book of, 139, 245.
Dionysius, *De eccl. hierarch.*, 251.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 13, 14, 44, 144.
Dionysius of Corinth, 4.
Dionysius Exiguus, 71.
dominicale, 137.
Donatists, 107, 111, 112.
Dorotheus, Bishop of Thessalonica, 44-46, 203.
dove (see also *columba*), 101, 187, 194-6, 209-11.
Dunstan, St., Biography by Adelard, 27.
Dunstan, St., *Concordia*, 21.
" *Vita*, 22, 27.
Durandus, *Rationale divin. offic.*, 150, 192, 201.

Eadfrid, abbot, 212.
Easter-Eve, Easter Vigil, 76, 82, 83, 88, 108, 109, 177, 180, 199.
Ecclesia statuta antiqua, 125.
Edgar, Canons under King, 31.
Edmund of Canterbury, St., 238.
Edmundi Cant. Archiep., *Constit. provinc. S.*, 200.
Egberti Eborac., *Capitulare*, 135.
" " *excerptiones*, 30.
Egfrid, King, 128.
Egyptian Liturgy of St. Basil, 85.
Eloy of Noyon, St., 128.
encolpia, 100.
Epiphanius, St., 83, 223.
Eremberti Tolosan. ep., *Vita S.*, 128.
Ernulph of Rochester, *Epist. II ad Lambertum*, 157-60.
Ethiopic Liturgy, 202.
eucharistiale, 214, 219.
Euchologion, 89, 148, 248, 250, 251.
Euchologion, Armenian, 253.
" Barberini (8th cent.), 250.
Eudociae, Vita S., 201.

Eudoxia, Empress, 108.
eulogiae, 70-73, 77, 115, 118.
" Drews' theory as to origin of, 71, 72.
Eusebius, *H.E.*, 6, 14, 24, 63, 70, 142, 144, 220.
Euthymius, St., *Vita*, 52, 53.
Eutychiani papae exhortatio, 194.
Eutychius of Constantinople, 152.
Evagrius, *H.E.*, 96.
Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, 62, 109, 119, 203.
ἐφόδιον, chap. i.

Farfa, *Consuetudines* "*Farfenses*," 167, 168.
Ferdinand of Spain, 47.
feretrum, 259-61.
fermentum, 70, 71, 73-77, 80, 115, 118, 222, 225, 254.
filitorium (*phylacterium*), 214.
Finchale, 55.
Finnian, penitential of, 58.
fistula, 137, 148, 171.
Fleury, *ordo ad infirmum visitandum* of, 225.
Flodard, *Hist. eccl. Remen.*, 217.
Florinus, *De sacr. ord.*, 227.
Fox, Bishop, 60.
fraction, 79.
Fulbert of Chartres, *Epist.*, 67, 69.

Gabriel the Sionite, 47, 179.
Gelasian sacramentary, 27, 85, 86, 88, 125, 126, 132, 177, 218, 232.
Gelasianum, 232.
Gelasius I, Pope, 49, 119, 162.
" II, Pope, 65.
Gellone, Sacramentary of, 86, 88.
Gennadius Massiliensis, 40.
Geraldi Auriliac, Vita S., 22.
" *Vita S.*, 166.
Geraldus, *Vita S. Stephani*, 21.
Gerbert, Pope, 203.
Germanus of Paris, St., *Expositio brevis ant. liturg. Gall.*, 77, 78, 189, 217, 219, 252.
Germanus of Constantinople, St., 83.
Germain des Près, St., 92.
geza, 254, 255.
Gieseric, 112.
Gilbert of Sempringham, St., 166.
Gildas, *De poenit.*, 58.
Giraldus Cambrensis, *Gemm. eccles.*, 145, 175, 181, 221, 229, 262, 263.
Giraldus Cambrensis, *Top. Hib.*, 64, 214, 238.
Godrici, Vita S., 27, 55.
Good Friday, 82, 85-93, 109, 151, 205, 261.
Gorgonia, 106, 193, 256-8.
Gratian III, *De consecrat.*, 119.
"Gregorian" sacramentaries, etc., 59, 66, 131, 132, 134, 136-8, 156, 173, 177, 207, 219, 223, 232, 233.
Gregorianum, 132.
Gregory Nazianzen, St., 193.
Gregory Nazianzen, St., *Orat.*, 6, 26, 106, 107.
Gregory Nazianzen, St., *Gregorii Theologi opera.* (ed. Bened.), 26, 257.
Gregory of Nyssa, St., *Epist. Canon. ad Letoium*, 7, 8.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, St., *Panegyric on Origen*, 4.
Gregory of Tours, *Mirac. de gloria martyr.*, 78, 96, 189, 209, 210, 217.
Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, 119.
Gregory the Great, Pope St., 83, 120.
Gregory the Great, Pope St., *Dialog.*, 55, 62, 63, 100, 114, 115, 118, 119.
Gregory the Great, Pope St., *Exposition of Ezekiel*, 54.
Gregory the Great, Pope St., *Vita* (by Paul the deacon), 142.
Gregory III, Pope, *Judicia*, ascribed to, 184.
Gregory VII, Pope, 65.
Guarinus, abbot, 166.

Hadrian, Pope, 131, 232.
Henry II, of England, 212.
Herardi Turonen. Capit., 30.
Herbert Poore, Bishop, 196.

Hereford missal, 151.
Herluin of Bec, St., *Vita*, 22, 214.
hermits, 26, 27, chap. v.
Hesychius, *In Levit.*, 97.
Hilary of Poitiers, St., *Fragmenta*, 61, 62.
Hilary of Poitiers, St., *Opus hist. frag.*, 112.
Hilary, Pope, 210.
Hild, St., 127.
Hildebert of Tours, 152, 156.
Hildegund, St., 166.
Hill Deverel, 197, 238.
Hincmar of Reims, 135.
Hincmar of Reims, Capitular of, 215.
Hincmar of Reims, *Synod.*, 227.
Hippolytan Church Order, 36.
Hippolytus, Canons of, 36.
Holy Week, 76, 82, 84, 85–93, 108, 109.
Honoratus of Vercellae, 63.
honorific use of Eucharist, 43, chap. vii.
Honorius of Autun, *Gemma animae*, 163.
Honorius III, Pope, 198.
Hormisdas, Pope, 203.
Horningsham, 197.
Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 237.
Hugh de Flavigny, *Chron. Virudinens*, 195.
Hugh de Flavigny, Life of Abbot Richard, 166.
Humbert, Cardinal, *Adv. Calumn. Graecor.*, 83, 90, 97, 98, 155.
Huriulf of Centule, Chronicles of, 207.
Hurst, Chapel at, 197.
husel portic, 189.

Ignatius of Antioch, St., *Ad Philadelph.*, 73.
Ignatius of Antioch, St., *Ad Romanos*, 10.
Ignatius of Antioch, St., *Ad Smyrnaeos.*, 73.
Infant communion, chaps. xi and xvii.
Innocent I, Pope, 9, 199, 210.
Innocent I, Pope, *Ep. ad Decent.*, 75, 76, 82.
Innocent III, Pope, 198.
Innocent III, Pope, *De sacro alt. myst.*, 164.
Intinction, etc., vi; 18, 45, 59, 69, 89, 90, 119, 124, 125, 131, 134–43, chap. x passim, 177, 179, 180, 193, 217, 240, 247, 251.
Invent. S. Capell., 208.
Irenaeus, St., *Fragmenta Ep. ad Victorem*, 70, 72.
Isaac, Bishop of Langres, Capitular of, 141.
Isaaci Lingonensis, Canones, 125.
Isidore of Seville, 71, 152.
Isidore of Seville, *De eccl. offic.*, 223.
"Isidorian" decrees, 221.
Iso of St. Gall, *De mirac. S. Othmari*, 100.
Ivo of Chartres, *Decret.*, 136, 163.
" " *Serm.*, 163.

Jacobites, 179, 229, 230.
James of Edessa, 96, 229.
Jerome, St., *Epist.*, 40, 45, 62, 203.
Jerome, St., *Commentary on Ezekiel*, 109, 110, 188.
John of Avranches, Bishop, *De offic. eccles.*, 156.
John Damascene, St., *Barlaam and Joasaph*, 25.
John the deacon, 142.
John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, 42, 43, 53, 73.
John of Telala, 230.
Jonas of Bobbio, *Vita Columbani*, etc., 128–30.
Julian, Emperor, 111.
Julius I, Pope, 154, 158, 159, 162, 181.
Justin M., St., *Apol.*, 6, 17, 18, 33, 34, 221.
Justinian, *Novellae*, 21, 30.

kivot, κιβώτιον, 202, 208, 219, 251, 252.
kovtcheg, 202, 219, 251, 252.

Lando, Bishop of Reims, 217.
Lanfranc, 152.
Lanfranc, *De corpore et sanguine domini*, 163.
Lanfranc, *Statuta*, 170, 171, 259.
lapsi, 12, 117.
Lausiac history of Palladius, 51.
Lawrence, archdeacon of Rome, 223.
Lawrence O'Toole, St., *Vita*, 64.
Leges presbyter. Northumbr., 183.
Leo Allatius, 250.
Leo Marsic., 215.
Leo I, Pope St., *Serm.*, 49, 118.
Leo III, Pope, 208.
Leo IV, Pope, 193.
Leo IX, Pope, 166.
Leofric missal, 137, 138, 145, 151, 219.
Leonian Sacramentary, 13, 125.
Liber Pontificalis, 25, 74, 199, 208, 210.
Lightfoot, Bishop, *Apost. Fathers*, 4.
Limoges, 185.
Lindisfarne, 189, 194, 215.
Liturgy of St. Basil, 15.
Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, 94.
Liturgy of St. Mark, 15.
Liturgy of the Nestorian Church, 93.
Louis VI, "the Fat," King of France, *Vita*, 23, 165.
Louis, St., 46, 47, 213.
Lucae Junioris, *Vita S.*, 54.
Luciani presb. Antioch., *Acta S.*, 24.
Lucius of Hadrianople, 112.

Macarius of Egypt, St., 51, 52.
Maldonatus, 148.
Manichaean heresy, 49, 162.
manna, 108, 116.
mansionarius, 225.
Manuale Ambrosianum, 172.
Manuale Ecclesiae Suessoniensis, 136.
Mar Israel, Nestorian Bishop of Kashkar, 254.
Marcellae, papae, *Acta*, 25.
Marcellus of Ancyra, 61.
Marmoutier, 165, 218.
Maronites, 47, 179.
Martène, 27, 47.
Mary of Egypt, St., 20, 109, 119, 146.
Matilda of Germany, Empress, *Acta*, 23.
Matthew Paris, 26, 212.
Maundy Thursday, 42, 43, 76, 85–7, 92, 109, 180, 182, 223, 248, 251, 254, 261.
Maximian of Syracuse, 62, 63.
Meaux, Synodal statutes of, 213.
Melaniae, *Vita S.*, 100, 101.
Michael the Patriarch (1167), 90, 148.
Miltiades, Pope, 74.
Missal of Robert of Jumièges, 173.
Missale Francorum, 126, 189, 207, 219, 252.
Missale Vesontionense (The Gallican Sacramentary), 28, 126, 219.
Misuse of the Eucharist, 39, chap. vii (F.), 56, 64.
Mochoemog, *Vita S.*, 56, 206.
Moissac Sacramentary, 28, 235.
Moling, Book of, 139, 245.
Molua, *Vita S.*, 57.
monstrance, 214.
Mozarabic texts, etc., 232.
" " *lectio de uno infirmo* in, 232.
Mozarabic hymn, 236.
Munnu, *Vita S.*, 57.

Nangiaco, Guilelmus de, 47.
Nestorian or East Syrian Church, 98, 179, 254, 255.
Nicephorus Callistus, *H.E.*, 48, 96.
Northumbrian priests, A Law of, 31.
Notker Balbulus, St., 166.
Novatian, 63.
Noyon, Sacramentary, *ordo* of, 86, 139, 235.

Odilia, St., 226.
" *Vita*, 138, 149, 202.
Odilo, St., 166.

Odo of Cluny, *Vita S. Geraldi Auriliac*, 22.
Odo of Paris (Eudes de Sully), 97, 186, 190, 203.
Odo of Paris, *Constit. synod.*, 215, 262.
Optatus, *De schism. Donat.*, 107, 111, 189, 256.
oratories, celebration of mass in, 20, 25.
Ordo ad communicandum infirmum (12th cent.), 139, 168.
Ordo of St. Amand, 76, 80, 91.
,, Fleury, 174.
,, Moissac, 174.
,, Pontlevy, 174.
,, Reims, 136.
Ordo Romanus, fragment of a, 91.
,, *Primus*, 75, 78, 79, 87, 88, 90, 150, 189, 205.
Ordo Romanus, *vi*, 137.
,, *viii*, 66, 212.
,, *x*, 205.
,, *x*, appendices to, 152.
Ordo Romanus, *xi*, 205.
,, *xv*, 212.
,, *ad usum monast.*, *Antiquus*, 85, 88, 90.
Ordines Romani, 162, 194.
Ordo, A mixed, 91.
Origen, *Commentary on St. John*, 14.
Origen, *Homilies*, 35, 36, 116, 258.
Orthodox Churches of the East, vi; 84, 146, 148, 149, 180, 201, 202, chap. xvii, 264.
Orthodox Churches of the East, The Greek Church, 95, 147, 182, 194, 202, 247, 248–51.
Orthodox Churches of the East, The Russian Church, 85, 145, 202, 208, 249, 251–3.
Osbern, biographer of St. Dunstan, 27.

Pain bénit, 71, 72.
Palladius, *De Vita S. Johann. Chrysostom dialog.*, 55, 108, 112.
Paschal II, Pope, 65, 162, 169.
Paschal II, *Ep. ad Pontium*, 170, 179.
Paschasius Radbert, 153.
pastophorium, παστοφόριον, 94, 110, 188.
Paul the deacon, 142.
Paulinus of Nola, St., 25, 26, 209.
,, *Epist.*, 110, 111, 188, 193.
Paulus Jovius, 65.
Peckham, Archbishop, *Constitutiones*, 175, 190, 197, 201, 238.
penitentials, and the reserved sacrament, 57, 58, 135, 164, 183, 184, 206, 207.
Penitential of Cumean, 206.
,, Halitgar, 206, 207.
,, Egbert, 184.
,, Theodore, 58, 184, 207.
peristerium, 208, 210.
Perpetuae et Felicitatis, Passio SS., 11.
Perpetuus of Tours, Will of St., 210.
Persian rite, 93.
perula, 214, 238.
Peter Amelius, 212.
,, ,, *Ordo Romanus* (13th cent.) of, 194.
Peter Damian, St., *Expositio canon. missae*, 156.
Peter Damian, St., *opuscula varia*, 149, 202, 203.
Peter Lombard, 153, 157.
Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, 170.
Petrus de Honestis, *Regula clericorum*, 174.
Philippi episc. Heracleae, Passio S., 11.
Photius (of Constantinople), 98.
Pole, Cardinal, 198.
Polycarp, Martyrdom of, 10.
Pontifical of Apamea, 66, 68.
,, Cambrai, 174.
,, Egbert of York, 98.
,, the Latin Church at Constantinople, 66.
Pontifical of Mayence, 66.
,, Narbonne, 148.
,, Salzburg, 66, 68, 139, 173.

Pontifical of Soissons, 67.
Pontificale Conchense, 66.
Pontific. Mogunt, 214.
Presanctified, communion, liturgy, mass of, 80–93, 117, 119, 147, 150, 151, 170, 180, 205, 248, 251, 262, 265.
Presanctified, origin of the rite, 87.
private celebrations, chap. iii.
Prudentius of Troyes, pontifical of, 235.
Pseudo-Alcuin, *De divinis officiis*, 66, 92.
Pseudo-Alcuin, *De eccl. offic.*, 259.
Pseudo-Amphilochius, *Vita S. Basilii*, 101, 194, 195.
Pseudo-Bede, 207.
Pseudo-Clement, *Ep. II, ad Jacobum fratrem domini*, 93, 94, 116.
Pseudo-Dionysius, *De eccles. hierarch.*, 102.
Pseudo-Egbert, 207.
Pseudo-Herembert, 129.
Pseudo-Isidore, 94.
Pseudo-Prosper, 144.
pugillaris, 137.
purificatio oris, 145, 149, 175, 203, 238.
pyx, *pyxis*, *buxis*, 22, 91, 100, 135, 138, 149, 151, 170, 187, 189–91, 193–8, 200–2, 205, 208, 210, 211, 213–6, 219, 237, 238, 240, 249–52, 255, 262, 263.
pyx, Suspension of, in English churches, 195–8.
πυξίς, πυξίον, πυξομῆλον, 202, 216, 249, 250.

Quivil, Bishop of Exeter (1287), 191.

Rabanus Maurus, De instit. cleric, 92, 223.
Rainaldus, Bishop of Como, 149.
Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, 194.
Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, *Synod. ad presbyteros*, 215, 228.
Ratram, *Contra Graecorum opposita*, 155.
Regino of Prüm, *De discipl. eccles.*, 228.
Regino of Prüm, *Notitiae*, 31, 96, 134–6, 138, 141, 148, 184, 185, 193, 215, 224, 227, 228.
Regist. S. Osmundi, 196, 216.
Regula magistri, 85, 90, 175.
Reims, 217.
,, Ritual of, 86.
,, *Statuta synodalia* of, 182.
Reinerus of Liège (1182), 195.
Remains of blessed sacrament, given to children, 96, 97.
Remains of blessed sacrament, burnt, 97, 98.
Remains of blessed sacrament, buried, 98.
Remberti, Vita S., 140.
Remi, St., *Test. S. Remigii*, 217, 232.
renewal of reserved sacrament, 115, chap. xii.
Réomée, Life of St. John, abbot of, 130.
reservation in both kinds, 18, 20, 62, 63, 84, 88, 108, 109, 118, 119, 127–9, 133, 138–43, 146, 148, 149, 153, 165, 169, 177, 202, 221, 222, 229, 250, 251, 253, 265. See also "intinction."
Responsio ad rusticum Narbonensem, 102.
restriction of celebration (to certain days of the week), 80–82, 87.
Rheinau, 172.
Richard Marsh, Bishop of Durham, 164, 237, 264.
Riom, 78.
Robert of Arbrisselle, St., *Vita*, 166.
Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, *Epist.*, 263, 264.
Robert Paululus, De caerimoniis, 178, 179, 181.
Robert Pullen, *Sentent.*, 161, 179.
Rodomi synodus generalis, 96.
Rodradi, codex, 133.
Rog. Hoveden. Chron., 196.
Romula, 114.
Rudolph of Bourges, 134.
Rudolph of St. Trond, 164.

Rufinus, *Hist. monachorum*, 26, 52.
Rupert, abbat. Tuit., *De incend. oppid.*, 215.
Rubert of Deutz, *De offic. divin.*, 163.

Saarbrück, John of, pontifical of, 59.
Sacrament house, 192, 197.
Sacramentarium, 191.
Sacramentarium Gallicanum. See *Missale Vesontionense.*
Sacramentary of Fulda, 133.
Sacramentary of Narbonne, 23, 172, 224, 235, 236.
Sacramentary of Ratoldus (*codex Ratoldi*), 66, 133, 137, 156.
Sacramentary of St. Remi, *ordo ad visitandum infirmum*, 132, 137, 140, 232, 240, 244.
sacrarium, 111, 189, 190.
sacristy, 78, 86, 94, 110, 111, 115, 188, 189.
Sahak, St. (of Armenia), 48, 182, 253.
Sahidic ecclesiastical canons, 94, 116.
St. Albans, 212.
Sainte Chapelle, La, 198, 214.
Salisbury, inventory of (1220), 211.
sancta, 70, 76, 77–80, 115, 189, 204, 205, 217, 222, 223, 226, 254.
Sarum, diocese of, 196, 198.
scyphus, 150.
Sedulius, *Carmen paschale*, 209.
Selsey, 129.
Senchus Mor, 228.
Serapion, story of, 13, 14, 112, 118.
serpadoop, 253.
Severus of Antioch, 43, 44, 199, 209.
siboigne, 209.
Sicardus of Cremona, 90.
Simeon Metaphrastes, *Life of St. Inda*, 201.
Siricius, Pope, 74.
Sophronius, 83.
Sozomen, *H.E.*, 48.
spiritual communion, 26, 51.
spoon, communion-spoon, λαβίς, *lzhitza*, 147–9, 155, 250–2.
station-days, 36, 37, 81, 96.
Stephen of Autun, *De sacramento altaris*, 156.
Stephen, King of England, 196.
Stephen III, Pope, 65.
Stephen IV, Pope, 65.
Stephani Muretensis, Vita S., 21.
Stowe missal, 136, 138, 139, 232.
Stowe missal, rite for sick-communion (text), 245.
Strasburg missal (14th cent.), 92.
subdeacon, 79, 89, 137, 150, 156, 171, 226, 227.
Sunning, 197.
Surius, 64, 201.
Swallowcliffe, church of, 196.
Synods. See Councils.

tabernacle, *tabernaculum*, 190–2, 197, 198, 212, 215, 216, 218.
tabout, 202.
Telesphorus, Pope, 159.
Tertullian, 44, 45, 46.
,, *Ad uxorem*, 37.
,, *Adv. Valentin*, 209.
,, *De corona*, 258.
Tertullian, *De exhortat. castitatis*, 37, 38.
Tertullian, *De fuga*, 11.
,, *De oratione*, 36, 37.
Testament of our Lord, 19, 42, 222, 226.
Tharsitius or Tarcisius, 19.
Theodore of Andida, 83.
Theodore, Pope, 98.
Theodore the Studite, *Epist.*, 53, 54.
Theodulfi Aurelianen., *Capitulare*, 30, 133, 234.
Theophilus of Alexandria, 55, 112.
Theotonii, Vita S., 166.
Thomas Aquinas, St., 152.
Thomas à Becket, St., 64.
Tours, diocese of, 133.
transubstantiation, 156, 157, 187, 266.
Trebnik, 145, 253.
turris, 78, 115, 118, 126, 189, 196, 199, 204, 209, 214, 216–9, 252.

Udalric of Cluny, His version of *Antiqu. Consuet.* of Cluny, 131, 168, 169, 187, 195, 240.
Ulpian, *Digest.*, 30.
Uranius, *Epist.*, 25.
Urseolus, St. Peter, 140.

Vaast of Arras, St., *Vita Vedasti episc. Atrebatensis.*, 128.
Valerian, Bishop of Abbenza, 112.
Venantius Fortunatus, *Miscell.*, 217.
Verba seniorum, 26, 53.
Verona, a Canon of, 216.
viaticum, chap. i and passim.
Victor Vitensis, *De persecut. Vandal.*, 111.
Vincentian, St., *Vita*, 129.
Voyage littéraire de deux religieux Bénédictines, 192.
Walfrid, Life of St., 141.
Walter of Orleans, 134.
Walter of Rouen, Bishop, 228.
William of Angers, 225.
William Brewer, 196.
William of Bourges, St., 166.
William of Champeaux, 153.
William of Champeaux, *De sacramento altaris*, 159, 160, 179.
William of Hirschau, 168.
William of Hirschau, *Constit. Hirsaugiens*, 169.
William de Toucy, Bishop, 213.
Wine, Communion in the sole species of, 123, 145, 160, chap. xi.
Witmund of Aversa, 152.

Zephyrinus, Pope, St., 74.

THE ALCUIN CLUB

Founded with the object of promoting the study of the History and use of the Book of Common Prayer.

President

The Right Rev. Charles Gore, D.D., Bishop of Oxford.

Committee

Athelstan Riley, Esq., Sr., M.A., *Chairman.*

E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley, Esq., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.
The Rev. E. M. Blackie, M.A.
The Rev. F. E. Brightman, M.A., D.D., D.Phil. Louvain.
Cyril S. Cobb, Esq., M.A., B.C.L., M.V.O.
The Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D.
The Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones, M.A.
F. C. Eeles, Esq., F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot.
The Rev. W. Howard Frere, D.D.
Stephen Gaselee, Esq., M.A.
Sir W. H. St. John Hope, Litt.D., D.C.L.
Harold C. King, Esq., M.A.
Vivian H. King, Esq., A.R.I.B.A.
The Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.
The Rev. J. N. Newland-Smith, M.A.
The Ven. J. H. Srawley, D.D.
The Rev. R. M. Woolley, D.D.
The Rev. Canon Chr. Wordsworth, M.A.
E. G. P. Wyatt, Esq., M.A.

Hon. Secretary

The Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones, M.A.,
S. Mary's Vicarage, Primrose Hill, London, N.W.

Hon. Treasurer

Vivian H. King, Esq., A.R.I.B.A.

Assistant Secretary

Miss Ward
Office: 46 Stanley Gardens, South Hampstead, London, N.W.

Bankers

The London and Provincial Bank, 55 England Lane, London, N.W.

THE ALCUIN CLUB exists in order to encourage and assist in the practical study of ceremonial, and the arrangement of Churches, their furniture and ornaments, in accordance with the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, strict obedience to which is the guiding principle of the work of the Club.

The Club shall consist of Members and Associates, to be elected by the Committee.

The Subscription for *Members* shall be 20*s*. per annum, entitling them to all publications *gratis*; and for *Associates*, 2*s*. 6*d*. per annum, entitling them to such of the Tracts *gratis*, and such reductions on other publications as the Committee may determine. There shall be no Entrance Fee, nor Composition for Subscriptions.

Applications for election should be sent to the Assistant Secretary, Miss Ward, 46 Stanley Gardens, South Hampstead, London, N.W., as well as all Subscriptions.

The Annual Report and List of Members, as well as the List of Publications, can be obtained from the Assistant Secretary.

LANTERN SLIDES.—A varied selection of slides for lectures can be hired from the Club. Further particulars on application to Vivian H. King, Esq., 13 Eton Road, London, N.W.

PUBLICATIONS

COLLECTIONS

I. **English Altars.** A large folio volume with 14 pp. of Collotypes. Explanatory Notes by Sir W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE, Litt.D., D.C.L. [*Out of print.*]

II. **Exposition de la Messe.** A large folio volume containing a Treatise on the Mass from a French Version of the Legenda Aurea of Jacobus de Voragine, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, and 22 plates from Illustrations in this MS. Together with four Tracts from "The Lay Folks' Mass Book," "Merita Missæ," etc. Edited by the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D. Price £1. 10*s*.

III and IV. **Pontifical Services,** vols. i and ii. Two large folio volumes containing Descriptive Notes and a Liturgical Introduction by the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D., and 20 plates of 62 Illustrations from Miniatures of the XVth and XVIth centuries. Price £1. 10*s*. each.

V. **Dat Boexken vander Missen.** (The Booklet of the Mass.) By GHERIT VANDER GOUDE, 1507. 34 woodcuts illustrating the Celebration of the Holy Communion, described, and the explanatory text of the Flemish original translated, with illustrative excerpts from contemporary missals and tracts by the Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. Price £1. 1*s*.

VI. **The Edwardian Inventories for Bedfordshire.** Edited by F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot., from transcripts by the Rev. J. E. BROWN, B.A. Price 5*s*.

VII. **The Edwardian Inventories for Huntingdonshire.** Edited by Mrs. S. C. LOMAS, editor of "State Papers Charles I Addenda," etc., from transcripts by T. CRAIB. Price 10*s*.

VIII. **Pontifical Services,** vol. iii. Descriptive Notes and 143 Illustrations from woodcuts in pontificals of the XVIth century. Edited by F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot. Price £1. 1*s*.

IX. **The Edwardian Inventories for Buckinghamshire.** Edited by F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot., from transcripts by the Rev. J. E. BROWN, B.A. Price £1. 1*s*. [*Out of print.*]

X. **Fifty Pictures of Gothic Altars.** Descriptive Notes and 50 Illustrations. Edited by the Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. Price £1. 1*s*.

XI. **The Sarum Missal in English.** Two volumes, containing a translation of the complete Sarum Missal by the Rev. F. E. WARREN, B.D., F.S.A. Price £1. 2*s*. 6*d*. [*Out of print.*]

XII. **Pontifical Services,** vol. iv. Descriptive Notes and 134 Illustrations from woodcuts in pontificals of the XVIth century. Edited by ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A. Price £1. 1*s*. [*Out of print.*]

XIII. **A History of the Use of Incense in Divine Worship.** xx + 404 pp. 60 Illustrations. By E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. Price £3.

XIV. **Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation,** vol. i. An Introduction on the theory, history, and practice of Episcopal and other Visitations. By the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D. Price £1.

XV. **The Same,** vol. ii (1536–58). Edited by the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D., with the assistance of W. M. KENNEDY, M.A. Price 30*s*.

XVI. **The Same,** vol. iii (1558–75). Edited by the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D. Price 30*s*.

XVII. **Traditional Ceremonial and Customs connected with the Scottish Liturgy.** By F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot. Price £1.

XVIII. **The Rationale of Ceremonial, 1540–1543,** with Notes and Appendices and an Essay on the Regulation of Ceremonial during the reign of King Henry VIII. By C. S. COBB, M.A., B.C.L. Price 10*s*.

XIX. **Illustrations of the Liturgy.** Thirteen drawings of the Celebration of the Holy Communion in a parish church. By CLEMENT O. SKILBECK. With Notes descriptive and explanatory, an Introduction on "The Present Opportunity," and a Preface on the English and American Uses. By Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. Price 4*s*. 6*d*. net.

XX. **The Edwardian Inventories for the City and County of Exeter.** Edited by Miss B. CRESSWELL, from transcripts of the original documents in the Guildhall, Exeter. Price 10*s*.

XXI. **The Sacrament Reserved; being a History of the Practice of Reserving the Eucharist up to the IVth Lateran Council.** By the Rev. W. H. FREESTONE. Price £1.

TRACTS

I. **Ornaments of the Rubric.** (Third Edition.) By J. T. MICKLETHWAITE, F.S.A. Price 5*s*.

II. **Consolidation.** (Second Edition.) By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of S. Paul's. Price 1*s*. [*Out of print.*]

III. **Liturgical Interpolations.** (Second Edition.) By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A. [*Out of print.*]

IV. **The Parish Clerk and his right to read the Liturgical Epistle.** By E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. [*Out of print.*]

V. **A First English Ordo: A Celebration of the Lord's Supper with one Minister, described and discussed by some members of the Alcuin Club.** Price 2*s*.; or 1*s*. in stiff paper covers.

VI. **The People's Prayers: Being some considerations on the use of the Litany in Public Worship.** By E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.; or 6*d*. in paper covers.

VII. **The Sign of the Cross in the Western Liturgies.** By the Rev. E. E. BERESFORD COOKE. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

VIII. **The "Interpretations" of the Bishops and their Influence on Elizabethan Policy.** By W. M. KENNEDY, M.A. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

IX. **Prayer Book Revision: The "Irreducible Minimum."** Edited by ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A. Price 2*s*. net.

X. **The Bread of the Eucharist.** By the Rev. R. MAXWELL WOOLLEY, D.D. With 11 Illustrations. Price 4*s*. 6*d*. net.

XI. **English or Roman Use?** By E. G. P. WYATT, M.A. Price 1*s*. net; cheap edition, 3*d*. net.

XII. **A Russian Criticism of the American Liturgy.** Edited by the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D., and WILFRID BARNES. [*In preparation.*]

PRAYER BOOK REVISION PAMPHLETS

I. **Liturgical Interpolations and Prayer Book Revision.** By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A. Price 1*s*.; or in paper covers, 6*d*.

II. **The Liturgical Gospels.** By the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.; or in paper covers, 1*s*.

III. **A Century of Collects.** Selected and Translated by the Rev. ATWELL M. Y. BAYLAY. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.; or in paper covers, 1*s*.

IV. **The Manual Acts.** By the Rev. VERNON STALEY. Price 1*s*.; or in paper covers, 6*d*. [*Out of print.*]

V. **The Eucharistic Prayer.** By E. G. P. WYATT, M.A. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.; or in paper covers, 1*s*.

VI. **Memorial Services.** Extracted by permission from "A Prayer-Book Revised," as issued in 1913 with a Preface by the BISHOP OF OXFORD. Price 1*s*.; or in paper covers, 6*d*.

REDUCED PRICES.—Members can still obtain, through the Assistant Secretary, some of the earlier publications at a reduction.

For all information apply to Miss Ward, 46 Stanley Gardens, South Hampstead, London, N.W.

PUBLISHERS.—Messrs. A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 28 Margaret Street, London, W., and 9 High Street, Oxford.

PRINTED BY A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON AND OXFORD

BV
825.56
.F730
1917

BV
825.56 Freestone, W.H.
.F730 Sacrament
1917 reserved.

DATE	ISSUED TO

HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.
MAR 89
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962